

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude A. Bonvillian to be a Lieutenant.
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
Edwin Guthrie.
Frederic T. Van Auken.
William A. Hodgman.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Thomas J. Sullivan, Baltic.

INDIANA.

Lloyd W. Dunlap, Mentone.

NEW JERSEY.

Thomas C. Birtwhistle, Englewood.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James H. Alcorn, Waterford.

Oscar E. Letteer, Berwick.

VIRGINIA.

W. R. Rogers, Crewe.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 21, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Zed H. Copp, of the city of Philadelphia.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I really believe we ought to have a quorum in the Senate to-day, and I suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Bankhead	Hollis	Overman	Sterling
Bradley	Hughes	Page	Stone
Brady	James	Penrose	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Jones	Perkins	Swanson
Bristow	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	La Follette	Robinson	Thornton
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Townsend
Chilton	Lea	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sheppard	Walsh
Colt	Lodge	Sherman	Warren
Fall	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will take occasion to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] on account of illness.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] are absent from the city on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., remonstrating against the Owen-Glass currency bill. The resolution is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a currency measure known as the Glass-Owen currency bill—

Now, therefore, we, the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., believing that such currency bill is in many of its features undemocratic and undesirable, do hereby resolve that we deem it for the best interests of the country that such bill be rejected, and we do hereby request our Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to defeat the bill; be it further

Resolved, That in the opinion of this committee the proposed measure, instead of providing for an expanding and flexible currency adequate to care for the business demands of the whole country at all times, unwarrantably reduces the power and limits the ability of the banks in the agricultural communities of the country to furnish the credit needed during the period of crop moving; be it further

Resolved, That in our opinion the money question is paramount to all others at all times, and we believe that legislation touching so vital a subject should have the most careful consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That we affirm it to be our belief that Congress alone should have the power to coin and issue money. We declare our

adherence to the doctrine laid down by President Jackson, who said that this power could not be delegated to corporations or to individuals. The Democratic Party has always recognized this policy and it has often made the demand that all paper which is made a legal tender for public and private debts or which is receivable for dues to the United States should be issued by the United States Government. We are therefore opposed to the enactment of any currency measure which aims to discredit the sovereign right of the National Government to issue all money, whether of coin or paper, and to delegate this power to a Federal reserve board as is contemplated by the Glass-Owen currency bill.

At a meeting of the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., held on the 7th day of August, 1913, the above resolution was adopted by a motion duly made, seconded, and carried.

WILLIAM A. SMITH,
Chairman of the Committee.
HUGO M. NICHOLSON,
Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions signed by sundry citizens of Norwalk, Anaheim, Artesia, Santa Ana, Whittier, and Compton, all in the State of California, praying for the adoption of the proposed tariff referendum, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Poughkeepsie, Nyack, Saratoga Springs, and Ithaca; of the Woman Suffrage Study Club of New York City, the Political Equality Club of Warsaw, the Woman's Political Union of Nyack, and of the Cornell Equal Suffrage Club, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

LANDS FOR RESERVOIR PURPOSES.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1784) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 104) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3017) designating certain lands as an addition to the Capitol Grounds, and establishing the Capitol Park; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3018) for the relief of Elizabeth B. Sarson; and
A bill (S. 3019) for the relief of the estate of James H. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3020) for the relief of the estate of John H. Wisdom, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) providing for a second edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) appropriating \$150,000 for the improvement of the Tennessee River (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I offer a resolution which I should like to have read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania submits a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 167), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes that it has been the policy of the United States to maintain the Monroe doctrine throughout the Western Hemisphere, and that the United States acknowledges its responsibility under the Monroe doctrine; that there exists in the Republic of Mexico a condition of internal warfare and lawlessness, and that a continuation of these present conditions, accompanied by the destruction of property, may involve international complications and intervention by European nations.

Resolved, That it is believed by the Senate that it is the first duty of the Government of the United States to protect the lives and property of its citizens at home and abroad, and that such protection in the Republic of Mexico will lessen the prevailing lawlessness and destruction of lives and property, and the danger and complications that might arise from European intervention in the Republic of Mexico.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate it is not the policy of the Government of the United States to recognize, aid, or assist any faction or factions in the Republic of Mexico.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to take such steps as are necessary to place a sufficient number of troops, as a constabulary, in the Republic of Mexico wherever and at such points as in his opinion they may be needed properly to police and to protect American citizens and their property; and it is hereby declared that such employment of troops for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens is not made with any intent that such policing and protection shall be construed as an act of hostility or unfriendliness toward the Mexican nation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the resolution may go over.

Mr. PENROSE. I made the same request when I offered the resolution. I asked that it might lie on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not hear it.

Mr. PENROSE. I submit the following amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill, which I understand is being prepared in the House of Representatives, although not yet reported from the committee. I ask to have the amendment lie on the table until the bill comes to the Senate. I ask to have the amendment read. It is an accompaniment to the resolution which I have just offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

For the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in the Republic of Mexico, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President and to remain available until July 1, 1914, \$25,000,000.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak at length, of course, on the amendment or the resolution at this time. I merely want to remark that the administration has asked for \$100,000 to take Americans out of Mexico. I think that they belong in Mexico. They have their constitutional rights there and their rights under our treaties and under international law. We have no right to demand that they shall break up the ties of home and occupation and leave a country where many of them have been practically all their lives. Rather than appropriate the pittance of \$100,000 to make this wholesale removal I would urge the spending of \$25,000,000 to keep them where they belong and to protect them in their legal occupations.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I would inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania what direction he desires to have the amendment take at the present time.

Mr. PENROSE. I asked to have the amendment lie on the table until the deficiency appropriation bill came over to the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I wish to say that in accordance with the wish of the Foreign Relations Committee, not expressing my views but the views of that committee, the amendment should properly go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PENROSE. It ought to go to the committee—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, it is true that hereafter the amendment would go to the Committee on Appropriations, but it is manifest that it concerns something more than the mere question of the appropriation of money. While I will not, unless it seems to be so desired, make the motion at the present time, I will make it at some future time.

I desire to say again that in so doing I am not expressing my individual views. I am simply the mouthpiece of the committee, and I am expressing the will of the committee unanimously agreed to by that committee, both Republicans and Democrats, that on all matters which relate to this most delicate question at this time there should be a reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration.

I beg to assure the Senator that in making the motion it is not with any disposition to interfere with whatever may be the proper disposition ultimately of this matter, but the purpose is that there shall now be given to all matters in this delicate situation a careful consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee, and I repeat in saying that I am expressing the views of the committee and obeying its direction.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has stated the action taken by the committee. I think it was the feeling of all the members of the committee that in a matter of such difficulty and delicacy, as we all recognize the Mexican situation to be, it is very desirable that any resolutions or amendments or action of any kind relating to the subject should have the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations before action in the Senate, and those instructions, if I may say so, were given to the chairman of the committee by unanimous vote. The committee take that view with no purpose of delay or anything of that kind. They are as deeply impressed with the responsibility and importance of the situation as any Senators can be, but they feel it to be very necessary that the committee should have the opportunity of con-

sidering these matters before any positive action is taken in the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I shall not at the proper time make any opposition to the due consideration of this or any other similar resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I know that they are a body of patriotic Senators, and as to anything that I might sponsor I would be only too glad to have their opinion and their more intimate knowledge of conditions before I would press it further.

This resolution is modeled almost verbatim from a similar paragraph in an appropriation bill passed during the Spanish War at the beginning of the difficulties with Cuba. I have forgotten whether or not that bill went to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other House or whether it went directly to the Appropriations Committee. At any rate, whatever the ultimate procedure may be, in a day or so I shall want to make a few remarks on this resolution, so I will ask that it lie on the table and later on that it go to the Foreign Relations Committee, if the Senator from Georgia so desires.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will allow me, with regard to an appropriation affecting foreign relations, I will say that it is customary to send amendments for the appropriation of money which involve foreign relations first to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I reported one the other day, which was recommended by the administration, authorizing a payment to the family of an Italian who had been killed in this country. That amendment went first to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that committee directed me to report it favorably and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PENROSE. That is entirely agreeable to me if it is the usual method.

Mr. LODGE. That is the usual method. Such a reference also makes an amendment in order before the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. But meanwhile I should like to have the resolution lie on the table, not to be called up should I be absent, so that a little later—it may be this week or early next week—I may have an opportunity to address the Senate on the subject.

I want to say, Mr. President, in this connection that I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and do not want to stir up this matter unnecessarily, but it is a real issue with me. The people of Pennsylvania are quite generally interested in Mexican conditions, and there is hardly a day that I am not in receipt of urgent telegrams and communications demanding that some prompt action be taken to remedy the conditions at present existing and becoming intolerable. It is not a sentiment; it is a condition.

I have an article here—I do not vouch for its accuracy, but I suppose it is as accurate as are most statements of this character—from the El Paso Morning Times of August 16, which, I believe, is a leading journal there. It will take but a moment to read it, and I should like to have the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me before it is read?

Mr. PENROSE. This will take but a moment.

Mr. NELSON. But I wish the Senator would yield to me now.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are unwise at this juncture to agitate this question. Our administration is now, so far as I can judge, doing the best it can to settle this difficulty; and the agitation caused by introducing resolutions of such kinds as have lately been introduced, thus keeping the subject before the public and agitating it in this manner, is only an embarrassment to our Government and can lead to no beneficial results. I for one, as a Senator of the United States, feel that the administration ought to be sustained in its effort to settle the difficulties in Mexico by peaceable and diplomatic methods. This amendment should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as all similar amendments have heretofore gone, and should not be used as a means of exploiting matters here in speeches at this time.

I think speeches on the Mexican situation are, at this juncture, out of place and will be an embarrassment to our Government. I want to remind Senators at this juncture of a little bit of history that we older ones remember well, because it transpired under our eyes and observation. We were very glad during the long, weary, and momentous days of the Civil War that no foreign Government intervened in our struggle, and that they allowed us to settle the struggle among ourselves. We were threatened time and again with intervention from France, from

Spain, and even from England. In one case the situation became so acute that a general of the United States at New Orleans was removed because of the complaint of foreign Governments. We were very glad to have foreign Governments keep their hands off and let us settle our controversy among ourselves. The treatment that we hoped and longed for, and which was accorded us during the days of the Civil War, we ought to be willing to accord to a sister Republic at this juncture, and not attempt to agitate the question and bring on war. We ought to permit Mexico, as we were permitted during the Civil War, to settle her internal troubles without warlike intervention on our part.

What is it Senators want? Intervention means war. Suppose we have a war with Mexico, there are 15,000,000 people in Mexico, and they will not quietly and supinely submit to have that country invaded and dismembered. Suppose we should get as the result of war what some people are pining for—two or three of the northern Provinces from Mexico and attach them to the United States—what good will it do us? The acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine by Germany as the result of the Franco-Prussian War has proved a great military burden to Germany, and has served in the intervening years to keep up more or less tension and friction between that country and France. It has been one of the causes that has led to the excessive arming of both countries and to the formation of triple and dual alliances. And while the people of those Provinces have been Germanized in speech, they still are, to a large extent, Frenchmen at heart. The experience of Germany and France would be ours if we should take the same course here, and as a result of war take two or three Provinces from Mexico. They would be a festering sore between us and that Republic for all time to come.

Therefore it seems to me that at this juncture we ought to do everything we can in this country to avoid war, and give the people of Mexico the same chance to settle their internal difficulties which we asked and obtained during the long and weary days of the Civil War.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I absolutely agree with everything which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has said in his remarks to the Senate. I have expressly declared in the resolution that no kind of political intervention or interference is contemplated.

Of course, we recall the dreadful days of our own civil conflict, but the then threatened intervention from Europe was of a political character. What the American people will gradually come to demand in the present situation is the police protection of American citizens and of American property, particularly near our own border.

We have been for a generation going down to Nicaragua and to other Central and South American Republics and landing marines to protect American lives and American property. So I do not think that I am proposing anything radical.

I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota and all Senators that I am as absolutely opposed to intervention and the recognition of anybody and, of course, to war, as is any Member of the American Congress; but I think I have a right to demand some action when the life of the son-in-law of the lieutenant governor of my State is threatened, and I still have no information as to his safety, and when millions of dollars of investments in the neighborhood of Durango owned by citizens of Pittsburgh have been destroyed, and when other citizens of Pennsylvania, reputable gentlemen, have appealed to me for some effort to protect them, I feel that I am justified in calling and should be permitted to call the attention of this body to the subject.

There is nothing in the resolution to warrant any apprehension on the part of the Senator from Minnesota or of any other Senator that I am trying to pose as a jingo. Why, Mr. President, the suggestion of annexation of any part of any territory is to my mind too absurd for an intelligent man to entertain for a moment. We want peace; we recognize the disorders which have prevailed too frequently in our own history; we look with regret and charity on the difficulties within the Republic to the south, but I do think we shall soon reach the point when we shall have to protect American property and American lives, particularly in the neighborhood of our own border.

I will now close, if the Secretary may be permitted to read the extract from the El Paso paper which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the extract asked for by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no State in all the Union that has suffered more, not only financially but perhaps also in the loss of life, than has the State of Utah during the present civil war in Mexico. From 5,000 to 6,000 of her citizens have been driven out of Mexico. So hurriedly were

they compelled to depart they left their homes overnight on freight trains, in box cars, or in any other way they could, to seek refuge at El Paso, Tex. They left the finest of homes and their fields that were ready for the harvest. Those homes have been ruined, their property has been destroyed, and a number of lives have been lost.

I desire to say to the Senate that Hon. A. W. Ivins, who might be termed the father of the Utah colonies, writes me that he speaks for a great number of the Utah people when he says they would rather lose every dollar of property they own in Mexico than to see intervention by this Government. He says, "Let them fight it out among themselves"; and I, too, believe in that policy.

I want to support the President of the United States in his endeavor to bring peace to that distracted country. I do not want to see the time come when we shall have to intervene and go to war with those unfortunate and helpless people.

I wanted to say this much, because I believe that the President is doing everything to-day that can be done, and I believe it would be bad policy for this Government at this time to intervene in Mexico and thus bring on bloody and costly war.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the sentiments uttered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and other Senators, all along the same line, must be extremely gratifying to every lover of his country. I think it is generally recognized that at this particular time it is not wise that there should be a discussion of this question. There are many matters which ultimately will have to be discussed, and there are many Senators who are anxious to be heard and who restrain themselves with difficulty. I am not speaking of myself now at all, but of others. As the reading of that newspaper clipping can not have any special beneficial effect at this time, as it can serve no purpose and can now illustrate no argument which the Senator is later going to make—for I understand the Senator does not now propose to discuss it, although I do not want to object to it—I simply want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he does not think that he could withhold it until such occasion when he thinks the time has arrived to address the Senate on the subject?

There would be no difficulty, Mr. President, in filling the RECORD with harrowing details of what is occurring in Mexico; but there is nothing new to be given to the public by putting it into the RECORD and having it now read; it has already been in the newspapers.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that all Senators might now unite in the carrying out of the intention and purpose which have been so admirably expressed by Senators on the other side this morning to give to the President, the officer of this Government who is clothed by the Constitution with the great duty of being the spokesman who shall communicate between this Government and foreign Governments, the opportunity now, in the midst of the effort which he is making, to proceed without hindrance and without embarrassment and with unanimous support, as he should have and as I think, practically, he does have, from the Senate. I want to ask the Senator if he will not, in view of the circumstances, withhold the reading of the article? I will not ask that he say that he will not at such time as he thinks proper read it; but I ask him if he will not withhold it now and let us proceed to other matters?

Mr. PENROSE. I introduced the resolution in entire good faith and with the firm conviction that it was my duty to introduce it, and I would not, of course, be willing to withdraw it now.

Mr. BACON. The Senator misunderstood me. I asked if he would not withhold the reading of the newspaper clipping which he has sent to the desk to be read.

Mr. PENROSE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am not particular about that.

Mr. BACON. That is all I asked the Senator to do.

Mr. PENROSE. I will withdraw that, if the Senator so desires. I want to work with him in the matter and with his committee and the administration; but I do feel that something must be done at an early date to suppress the brutalities, robberies, and molestations of Americans, particularly right near our own border.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have heretofore refrained from saying anything whatever upon the Mexican situation, but not because I was not as deeply interested in the subject as other Senators in this body, for, as my colleague [Mr. SMOOT] has very well said, my own State is very deeply interested in it.

I appreciate the good judgment and wisdom of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]; but I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, at this juncture of affairs I think

it is exceedingly unwise to enter upon a discussion in the Senate, especially in the open Senate, of this particular subject.

The former administration, with whose doings in Mexico I was personally more familiar than I am with the actions of the present administration, was doing precisely, so far as I understand, what this administration is doing.

I have personally every confidence in the patriotism and good judgment of the President of the United States. I have had an opportunity, in connection with others, of talking with him face to face; and no man can talk with him without being convinced that President Wilson is patriotically engaged in doing everything he possibly can to bring order out of the chaos which now exists in Mexico.

Under the Constitution of the United States the President of the United States is the accredited instrument that we use in dealing with all foreign nations; and in a situation like this I believe it to be the duty of every officer of the Government, of Senators and Representatives, to stand behind him in his efforts; and, although there may be some things that have been done or that may be done with which I would not entirely agree, I believe it to be the part of patriotism and good sense to withhold any criticism which I might otherwise have to make until the situation has clarified. Until it has clarified, it seems to me the wise and patriotic thing to do is to stand behind the effort which the President is making; and that I, for one, propose to do.

The reports in the morning papers which I read are to the effect that the officials of the Mexican Government are now saying that the sentiment of the President and the sentiment of the Senate differ with reference to what shall be done in Mexico. I think that is an exceedingly unfortunate condition of affairs. I think it would be far better, I think it would tend to uphold the hand of the President and to enable him far better to accomplish something if the contrary impression could go out—namely, that the Members of the Senate and the other officials of this Government are behind the President—instead of having the unfortunate impression go to the people of that country that our counsels are divided. So long as that condition exists the President of the United States is more or less handicapped in dealing with the situation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, merely a word. I cordially agree with what the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who has just taken his seat, has said as to the general position, but I should like to add this remark as to the present situation: The President of the United States, charged with the duty of conducting our relations with foreign countries, has been making an effort, in good faith and with all the wisdom and patience at his command, to bring about some arrangement in Mexico which would lead to peace and stable government. What the result of that mission is we do not know officially. We see only the accounts in the newspapers—the guesses, perhaps, that have been made. I do not think we can judge of the situation properly until we hear officially exactly what has been done. Until we know precisely about the result of this attempt at mediation, or such other matters as the President thinks wise to give to us or to the country, it seems to me we had better not enter upon debate, for debate, as reported in garbled form to other countries, is often misunderstood.

I am sure we are all actuated by the same desire, and that is to maintain the peace of the country, not to intervene, to avoid intervention if possible, and at the same time give full and proper protection to American life and American property.

I really think at this time, until we know a little more about the present situation, it is well not to enter upon debate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the suggestion just made by the Senator from Utah is a most valuable one. I do not think, however, that anything which could have occurred could give such emphatic denial to the possibility of the truth of the impression that seems to exist in Mexico in regard to any variance between the Senate and the President as has been given by the Senate in the patriotic utterances which have been heard in this Chamber to-day on each side, regardless of party. I am willing that they shall go as the answer to such an insinuation or such an impression. This answer of the Senate can not be misunderstood either in the United States or in Mexico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, during this entire controversy I have scrupulously refrained from saying a word. I entertain the precise views that have been expressed by other Senators on both sides of the Chamber. Yet I have sometimes wondered—and this is the only thought I propose to suggest—if it might not be well for the President to take the Senate into his confidence and communicate to this body through some source—properly the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session—precisely what the instructions were that were given to Mr. Lind. I do not think it would be well to publish

them to the world, but I do think that the Senate is entitled to that information. For one, desiring to uphold the President in every effort he can make to adjust affairs in Mexico, I feel that the Senate, which will have a very important duty to perform if this matter goes on much further, might well be put in possession of that piece of information.

Citizens in my own State have greatly suffered in their property and personal rights; but I have besought them at every point to be patient, hoping that a peaceful solution of the difficulties might be reached. I simply desire to add that I sympathize deeply with what has been said on both sides of the Chamber as to the desirability of ceasing needless agitation, which I feel sure can not possibly do any good, but it occurs to me that there will of necessity be less agitation on the part of the Senate if the President acquaints this body with the real facts in the case.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have had very little to say upon this interesting subject for some time, and I do not intend to occupy the time of the Senate now at any length.

I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] possibly misread the statement from Mexico, or at least he did not thoroughly understand the workings of the Mexican mind. My impression, obtained from the reports from Mexico, both through the papers and otherwise, is that Mr. Huerta claims to have private sources of information with reference to the differences which he says or intimates exist between the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States. I do not think there is any intimation that the public utterances, either in this body or in any other, have convinced Mr. Huerta that the President is not being supported by the sentiment of the country, but that private advices from private sources of his own have led him to make this statement.

I am one of those who believe that public opinion, which has been said to be the residuum of the power retained by the people under the tenth section of the Constitution of the United States, when correctly informed, will act correctly. I am inclined to think that the great mass of the American people are conservative, and that when they understand the conditions they will act in a conservative way. I think sometimes it is better to have discussion along certain lines than to suppress discussion. However, I have not objected to any attempt to shut off discussion at all. I have not agreed with that line of policy, but I am not criticizing the patriotism or the ability of the administration.

I am here to say that, as one Senator, I propose to sustain in every way possible, so far as my vote and influence and action may go, the President of the United States and the administration in dealing with this or any other foreign problem of such magnitude.

I do not agree with the idea that every discussion along every line of such an important matter as this should be closed off. I believe that had the people of the United States been fairly dealt with by the Congress of the United States prior to the Spanish-American War, had the people of the United States thoroughly understood the situation exactly as it existed, that war could have been avoided, and it would not have been brought on by an outburst of enraged opinion rather than well-informed opinion. I fear something of exactly the same kind may lead to a crisis in Mexican affairs; that instead of action based upon a well-informed public opinion, understanding the facts and the circumstances, something may occur which will so outrage the American people that no administration and no Congress supporting the administration can stop the natural course of this great warlike Nation when it becomes thoroughly aroused.

Of course I realize, as everyone else does, that the details of negotiations of a diplomatic character must necessarily be kept from the public. I realize very fully that time is necessary in all these matters. I am frankly in accord with the sentiment expressed by the other Senators that all necessary time be given for the present diplomatic arrangements to be concluded in a satisfactory way, if possible, or to be ended in some way. I am equally frank in the statement of my opinion that it will be very much better to follow the advice of one of the men who wrote, I think, most intelligently of our Constitution and our people, Mr. Bryce, who said that it was the duty and much the best policy that the President take into confidence, at least to as great an extent as possible, the Senate of the United States in such matters as this Mexican problem. I do not believe any administration can long act in accordance with the will of the people except in accord with the coordinate branch of the Government, which must act in foreign affairs, not only to sustain the hand but to carry out the objects of the administration, which deals directly in these matters. That, however, is merely a matter not so much of criticism as of difference of opinion.

I will say frankly that I believe a fair understanding of the conditions existing in Mexico to-day with reference to American lives, American property, and the conditions among the Mexicans themselves, fairly discussed, would inform the American people to such an extent that they could let their representatives in the Senate and in the House and in the White House know what the sentiment of the people was.

It has been said upon high authority that there is no sentiment upon certain phases of this Mexican question. I can say that in my judgment there is a growing sentiment in the United States, and one of resentment; there is a growing sentiment in every State in this Union. It is that sentiment, guided by misinformed or uninformed public opinion, which I fear, and not the sentiment of the people when they are thoroughly informed about the conditions.

We are not a people who rush headlong into war. I hope those who have the confidence of the administration will urge, or at least suggest, the view that the opinion of the people of the United States should be informed rather than inflamed. To attempt to suppress information, to suppress discussion, upon the insistence that war stares us in the face, is to inflame and not to inform public opinion. This is my judgment, Mr. President.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, a few days ago an address was delivered before the Republican Editorial Association of Indiana by the Hon. Charles W. Fairbanks, formerly Vice President of the United States—a man who was Presiding Officer of this body; a man with the respect and the confidence of all its Members; a man who, while a pronounced partisan, is recognized as being a careful student of public affairs, possessing enlightened views on public questions.

In this address brief reference was made to the Mexican situation. The sentiments expressed were patriotic sentiments, in line with those expressed on both sides of the Chamber this morning. It is because the sentiments expressed by him are in line with those expressed here, after reading a paragraph or two to express my own views, that I shall ask that the entire extract, which is short, may be printed in the Record.

He says:

I have no doubt that the disturbances in Mexico during the last few years have been due in a greater or less degree to an effort on the part of ambitious cunning men to force intervention and possibly annexation to the United States. The exploiters of public utilities and of the mineral and agricultural resources of our neighbor have undoubtedly thought that they would gain much if they could force intervention by the United States. There are soldiers of fortune in Mexico who would undoubtedly welcome such a contingency.

Sensationalists are adding to the confusion of the situation and making more difficult the solution of the problem. Intervention in Mexico is, of course, not a matter to be considered lightly; for intervention means war, and war means the destruction of human lives and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. It means, furthermore, the responsibility of the Government of 20,000,000 people for an indefinite period. We are now engaged in governing 10,000,000 aliens as the result of the Spanish-American War—a war which could very probably have been averted if we could have exercised a little more patience, patriotism, and self-restraint.

If our speculators in Mexico suffer pecuniary loss as the result of recurring revolutions, that is a matter for future consideration, when stable government and peace are fully established in that country. It is not warrant for shedding the blood of Americans. To sacrifice the life of one soldier for all of the dollars investors or speculators have ventured in Mexico would be the supremest criminal folly. Without a deliberate affront on the part of the Mexican Government, whether it exists de jure or de facto, is no good ground on which we would be justified in sending our armies beyond the Rio Grande.

He concludes by saying:

President Wilson is dealing with it—

The situation—

as best he can. We may not entirely agree that his course is better than that of his distinguished predecessor, nevertheless we should endeavor to uphold his hands.

There should be no difference of opinion as to that. By doing so we shall make his task a comparatively easy one.

It is not an hour for either little politics or sensational journalism. The clamor of the jingoes should not be allowed to drown the voice of rational, deliberate statesmanship. It is a pretty safe rule, when we come to deal with grave international problems, to put our faith in the President of the United States and follow where he may lead. He speaks for the country when we come to deal with international affairs. The President of the United States is a safer guide than sensationalists and the soldiers of fortune, who come to the surface whenever international controversies arise.

Those sentiments, Mr. President, were applauded vigorously and enthusiastically by a large body of the Republican editors of Indiana. I think it ought to go into the Record in connection with what has been expressed on the other side of the Chamber this morning, that it may be known in Mexico and everywhere that in the hour of supreme danger the American people stand as a stone wall with their administration in defense of the national honor and national right.

I ask that these remarks by Mr. Fairbanks be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Georgia the Senator from Pennsylvania withdrew a statement which he desired to have read and go into the Record. I think in the face of that the Senator from Indiana ought not to ask that this paper go into the Record. For that reason, and that reason only, I shall object to its being printed.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I can not consent that the sentiments expressed by the late ex-Vice President as to the character of the Americans in Mexico shall be applied to them as a whole. There are without doubt many characters such as he describes in Mexico, but there are also many very worthy American citizens, who went there, as they had a right to go, into a friendly adjoining country. Just as there are many thousands of American citizens in Canada to-day, there are thousands in Mexico, who are worthy, honorable, upright, and who are there for legitimate purposes. I do not think that a general statement of that character in regard to all Americans in Mexico should go without qualification.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRISTOW. In just a moment. I merely want to say, so far as sustaining the Government of our country in its effort to remedy the chaos that exists there, I think we are all agreed. We may hold different opinions as to the proper method that ought to be adopted, but that is only natural. While efforts are being made by the President to solve these problems and to protect our people in their rights, I think we ought to stand together.

I am in accord with many things which President Wilson has done. Some of the things I think he ought to have done differently, but probably he has acted more wisely than if he had followed the course which it seems to me was a better one. That is a question which time alone can determine.

But I do not want any general statement to be made branding every man and woman who may be in Mexico as the character of individuals described by Mr. Fairbanks in his address, because I happen to have some very warm friends in Mexico, men who are worthy of the protection of their Government wherever they may be, whether in Mexico or in any other foreign country.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BRISTOW. Very gladly.

Mr. KERN. Does the Senator understand that the late Vice President declared that every American in Mexico was of the character indicated by the Senator? He referred to a certain character of persons who are now agitating this question. It was not a general denunciation of Americans in Mexico.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seemed to me as the Senator read it that it was pretty general. I think the ex-Vice President should have referred to others who are worthy of his consideration as well as those who are not, because there are both kinds in Mexico.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the morning business closed?

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the morning business expired?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. The point I wish to make is that this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent; that there is nothing before the Senate and I think we might now go on with the tariff bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has seemed to cease by unanimous consent now, Mr. President, and I introduce a bill for reference.

[The bill introduced by Mr. GALLINGER appears under its appropriate heading.]

GOODS IN BOND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I offer a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to furnish, for the use of the Senate, so much of the following information as is now available:

First. The value of imported commodities now held under bond for warehousing or other purpose which have been entered without payment of duty.

Second. The value of such commodities so held at the same time in the year 1912.

Third. An estimate of the total amount of the duties payable upon such commodities under existing tariff laws.

Fourth. An estimate of the amount of duties which would be payable under the proposed tariff bill (H. R. 3321) as the same is reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. I was under the impression that a similar resolution was passed a few days ago. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I introduced a resolution of this same general character three weeks ago, asking for information which, I think, might have been furnished by the Treasury Department within a week. The delay in furnishing it to me is altogether unaccountable. There has been, as it seems to me, inexcusable procrastination about it. The resolution which I have now introduced differs from the former resolution in the particular that the resolution now calls for so much of the information as may be available.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me finish, if the Senator will allow me. We have now gone through the consideration of a very large part of the schedules of the tariff bill. It is going to be a matter of only a short time, I hope, until we shall have reached the administrative provisions of the bill. I, at least, consider the amendment which I have offered upon that subject to be of importance, and it is necessary in order that it may be intelligently considered that the Senate should have the information which has been requested.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is the reason why I have introduced the resolution modifying the former resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not going to object to the present consideration of the resolution if it does not lead to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I desire to announce that if physically able I shall submit a few remarks on the tariff bill on Tuesday next, immediately following the close of the morning business.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. PENROSE. There are two resolutions (Nos. 162 and 163) on the table introduced about a week ago by me relative to the Mexican situation. In view of the fact that they were preliminary and of minor character, and that I have to-day introduced resolutions of wider scope, and I hope of more effective results, I would be entirely willing to have the two earlier resolutions now referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would like to inform the chairman of that committee in this connection that if he wants any information from me or others as to what I know that I can produce about Dr. Hale or about conditions in Durango I will be very glad to communicate with him or to produce witnesses before him. I earnestly hope that he will give both resolutions early and earnest consideration.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the direction proposed by the Senator is a correct one. I beg to assure him that the committee will deal with the resolutions, as it does with all other matters, in a proper way.

Mr. PENROSE. I recognize that this is the regular parliamentary procedure, and I only desired to have the resolutions lie on the table until I could possibly make a few remarks on them. That course is now unnecessary, in view of the resolution of wider scope which I have presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PENROSE. Not the resolution I offered to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The former resolutions that came over from a preceding day.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for just a moment while I refer to a matter in regard to my address the other day on the sugar schedule? It will take just a minute.

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have a telegram received this morning from Mr. Ruffin Fowler, of Emporia, Kans. In my address the other day on the sugar schedule I read a clipping from the Emporia Gazette that was alleged to be an interview with

Mr. Fowler in regard to his experience in growing sugar beets and the rotation of crops. Some debate was the result of reading the interview with Mr. Fowler, and I made the statement then that I had not communicated with Mr. Fowler and knew nothing of the facts except as they appeared in the newspaper. This morning I received the following telegram from Mr. Fowler:

EMPORIA, KANS., August 20, 1913.

Senator J. L. BRISTOW,
Washington, D. C.

The article in the Emporia Gazette referring to my wheat grown on beet land is absolutely and positively correct in every particular, and I am willing to make oath to same.

RUFFIN FOWLER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada will proceed.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the State of Nevada, which I have the honor in part to represent, is numbered among the wool-producing States of the West. The present tariff bill places raw wool upon the free list. I am heartily in favor of such provision of the bill, and I am firmly convinced that it is for the best interests of the people of my State. I believe that a great majority of the citizens of Nevada are of the same opinion. I know that the Democratic papers of the State, with possibly one exception, are supporting the administration in placing raw wool upon the free list.

I realize, however, that some able and sincere Democrats in my State hold a contrary opinion, and that they are presenting to the people of the State the same erroneous statements and fallacious arguments by which they themselves were deceived. There is no doubt that such error is due to a blind faith in the representations of their friends who are engaged in the wool industry and a failure to properly analyze and apply the statistics relating to the production of wool.

The principal contentions of those who oppose free raw wool are:

- (1) That it will destroy the industry.
- (2) That it is a discrimination against the producer.
- (3) That it will injure the woolgrowing States.

I will discuss each of these complaints in the order presented.

WILL IT DESTROY THE INDUSTRY?

There is only one way in which it could be instrumental in destroying the industry, and that would be by permitting foreign wool to come into the country in such quantities and at so low a price that the American woolgrower could not compete and make a reasonable profit upon the business. The removal of the tariff will certainly permit foreign wool to come into the country, but the question is, How much will come in, and at what price can the foreigner afford to sell it in the United States?

In the first place, the foreigner can not afford to sell his wool in the United States for less than he can obtain for it in the markets of the world; and in the second place, he can not afford to sell it for less than it cost him to produce.

DEMAND INCREASING.

The price of wool in the markets of the world, the same as other products, depends upon the supply and the demand. For a number of years there has been a constant demand for all the wool that has been produced. There is now an active demand for the entire wool production. The demand for the article is increasing at a far greater rate than the supply. With the spread of civilization and the growth of enlightenment and prosperity among the masses, the desire for more and better clothing and bedding has grown, until woollens have come to be looked upon as a necessity rather than a luxury. This demand must be an ever-increasing demand, so surely as civilization must advance.

SUPPLY DECREASING.

What is the outlook for the supply? It has about reached its maximum and must decrease with the advance of civilization. Vast ranges of free or very cheap lands are essential to the success of sheep raising where the production of wool is the chief product of the industry. It is a primitive industry that precedes civilization, and as the home seeker, the settler, and the farmer advance, the wool raiser must retreat. He has now reached his last stand. There is nowhere he can retreat. There are no new ranges to exploit.

The Tariff Board appointed by President Taft in 1911, in discussing this phase of the subject, in its report says:

At the present time practically every acre of grazing land in the West is in use and somewhat overstocked, resulting in occasional heavy losses. * * * Practically all land in New Zealand available for grazing is at the present occupied by live stock, generally sheep; hence there is no possibility of any great expansion of the industry in the future.

In speaking of the sheep district of Argentina, the principal producer of sheep in South America, the board says:

The Province of Buenos Aires has approximately 35,000,000 sheep, or over one-half the total number in the Republic. The ranges are fully stocked and the number of sheep is decreasing owing to the inroad on the ranges by wheat farmers. The soil is rich and the carrying capacity of the range extremely high. The demand for the lands will doubtless decrease the number of sheep from now on.

And even in Africa we find no opportunity to greatly increase the supply, while the same causes that operate to decrease the supply in other countries will be operative there. The report says, in referring to Africa:

All the land available for sheep grazing seems now to be in use, although not fully stocked.

When there are men to cultivate land it is too valuable to be used for the raising of sheep exclusively for wool. As the land is withdrawn from the ranges for more profitable purposes, the herds must be decreased. Principally for such cause, between 1900 and 1910, the number of sheep in the United States decreased from 61,503,713 to 52,447,861, being a decrease of nearly 15 per cent in 10 years.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will I disturb the Senator by asking him a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator, with pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. I did not hear the date of the figures which the Senator quoted. Will he kindly give me the date?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will state to the Senator that I used round numbers, without giving the thousands.

Mr. WARREN. For what year?

Mr. PITTMAN. For the years between 1900 and 1910.

Mr. WARREN. I observe the shrinkage. Has the Senator before him and, if so, will he give us the explanation which both the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Department of Agriculture give, which is that the law required the taking of the census of sheep in April instead of in June, before the lambs were born, and that therefore the decrease is very largely accounted for? In fact, so the Government experts say, there were but few less sheep in 1910 than there were in 1900. The number of sheep of mature age—breeding ewes—was about the same; but the lambs were not counted, because they were dropped between the two dates. I do not know whether the Senator has noticed that explanation of those figures.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have noticed the matter to which the Senator refers. It is stated that, by reason of the taking of the census at a different period of time, there were apparently a fewer number of lambs; but I also call the Senator's attention to the report of the Tariff Board, which states that there has been a decrease in that length of time in the number of ewes and rams.

Mr. WARREN. I will not interrupt the Senator further now. I have all those matters, and I will bring them up in my own time.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. But I wanted to know if the Senator had noticed that fact.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have noticed that, and I think probably it may make a small difference in the 15 per cent, but it will be relative as the number of lambs are to the total number of sheep.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly yield to me a moment there?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it would be well if the Senator would let us know whether the preceding census, that for 1900, was not taken at the same time. Was not that taken at the same period of the year as the census of 1910?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it was not; and, therefore, I think the statement of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] in regard to lambs is probably correct. The census of 1900 showed probably a larger number of lambs than was shown by the last census.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought that it would be well, in the interest of the real truth of the situation, to know the period when each census was taken.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to be perfectly fair in the matter; and, if that is true, it would probably reduce the percentage to some extent, as the lambs are in proportion to the total number of sheep.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if it would not wipe out the whole percentage of decrease as given by him? Fifteen per cent of 60,000,000 in round numbers would be only 9,000,000 head. The Senator is certainly familiar enough with the sheep business to know that with 60,000,000 sheep in this country the lamb crop of any year would be 9,000,000 or more; and if it were 9,000,000, then the full 15 per cent of which he speaks would be wiped out.

Mr. PITTMAN. That would depend entirely, Mr. President, upon the particular periods when the respective censuses were taken and the particular number of lambs dropped within those particular dates, which I presume the Senator will be able to show at some other time.

In this connection I wish to state that the Tariff Board calls attention to the decrease of sheep first in the eastern part of the United States, and attributes that decrease to what I am now attributing it; that is, that the land is more valuable for other purposes than for sheep raising.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether the report of the Tariff Board shows or does not show a corresponding decrease in the wool clip?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes. I thank the Senator for that suggestion. I think it will be found that there has been a corresponding decrease not only in the wool clip, but in the number of grown sheep.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, quite the reverse is shown as to the wool clip, but I will bring that forward at some other time. Allow me to say right now, I think, that the Tariff Board, of course, took partial figures from the census and from the statistics of the Agricultural Department, but I have letters dated as late as yesterday from those two departments, which I will to-morrow or at some other time bring in, which show very plainly that the true sheep census of the United States is taken by those departments. The figures of the Tariff Board as to the number of sheep, as they were not called upon to report upon that fact, were drawn from portions of the reports only.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to say to the Senator that I realize that the report of the Tariff Board is very defective, but as a general thing the defect exists in favor of a high protective tariff rather than against it.

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to be put in a wrong position. I am not stating that the figures of the Tariff Board upon those matters which were relegated to them to ascertain are defective, but it was no part of their business to ascertain the number of sheep.

Mr. POMERENE. But that does not alter the fact.

Mr. PITTMAN. I was simply taking up this part of the argument for the purpose of showing that the number of sheep is decreasing, and the reason given by the Tariff Board, which I accept for the purpose of this argument, is that the range lands of the country have been exhausted and that the range lands are being decreased because the lands are being taken up by farmers for more valuable purposes.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is speaking, of course, of lands in the United States.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am speaking of lands everywhere.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator in so far as lands in the United States are concerned, but I disagree with him totally as to certain other countries.

Mr. PITTMAN. I agree with the report of the Tariff Board not only as to lands in the United States but as to lands in Australia, South America, and Africa.

Mr. WARREN. Possibly some parts of the Tariff Board report will hardly agree with what the Senator is now stating. However, we will let that pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. PITTMAN. Just a moment. I have the Tariff Board report here to substantiate everything I have said, and I have sufficient quotations here to sustain everything to which I refer.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the slightest doubt but that the Senator means to be absolutely accurate, and I do not question a figure he has given or that every fact set forth by him he has found where he says he has found it. I made the inquiry not to embarrass the Senator, but to bring up the matter of the difference in the periods when the census for 1900 and that for 1910 were taken, the difference being caused by the law. As to the other matters I prefer, and I know the Senator would, that I take them up in my own time.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am very pleased to have had the interruption.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it is appropriate here to call attention to the April number, 1913, of the North American Review, which contains an article entitled "Our wool duties," by Mr.

Thomas W. Page, former member of the Tariff Board, in which, upon the matter of the wool clip, on pages 452 and 453, he says:

It appears from this sketch that in spite of high protective duties, which have endured, with a single brief interruption, for generations, woolgrowing in the United States has become a waning industry. The census reports give evidence to the same effect. They show that the total number of sheep, excluding lambs, during the last 30 years has decreased in every decade. There has been some increase in the western division of the country, but that increase in the last decade was less than 3 per cent, and it was more than counterbalanced by losses in other sections. The amount of the total annual wool clip can only be estimated, and since it depends on weather conditions and other changing contingencies, it fluctuates from year to year. It may be said, however, that from the best estimates that can be made—and these estimates are accepted in business and are used in the Government reports—the average annual production in the five years ending in 1910 was about three hundred and eleven and a half million pounds.

This is nearly 4,000,000 pounds less than the average annual production in the five years that ended a quarter of a century earlier.

I beg pardon of the Senator from Nevada for interrupting him, but I thought the paragraph I have read might be appropriate in this connection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in this connection—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to claim that the decrease in the number of sheep was caused solely by the fact that the lands are being taken for other purposes and that they have become so valuable that the owners could not afford to carry sheep upon them.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am certain the Senator does not intend to misquote me.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did not say that it was due solely to that cause. There may be a great many causes operating to reduce the number of sheep. What I am simply going on to show now is that the demand is increasing. The only object of this part of my argument is to show that the demand is increasing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in 1894, when we had free wool, sheep decreased until, in 1897, there were only 36,818,000 head in the United States. After the duty upon wool was restored the number of sheep increased until we had 62,000,000 head, as the Senator has stated in his remarks.

Mr. WALSH. And now, Mr. President, they have fallen off until we have only 51,000,000 head instead of 62,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and the reason for that is that the lambs were not born at the time the 1910 census was taken, and accordingly the figures do not show the increase of sheep for that year.

Mr. WALSH. I am not giving the Senator the census report at all. I am giving the report of the Agricultural Department for 1913.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, I simply say that I was referring to the figures to which the Senator from Nevada was referring in his speech, and I quoted the figures as to the number of sheep for 1895, 1896, and 1897 from the Agricultural Department. Mr. President, there is no doubt about it. [Laughter.] The Senator refers to 1894 and 1895.

Mr. JAMES. No; I am talking about the number of sheep, which has fallen off, as suggested by the Senator from Montana, about eleven or twelve million, from 1903 to 1913; and still all that has gone on under a high protective tariff on wool; but if during this time wool had been free, then the Senator would have said that it was all attributable to free wool.

Mr. SMOOT. I misunderstood the Senator, for if the Senator will look at the figures he will find that just as soon as there was a duty on wool the number of sheep increased very rapidly.

Mr. JAMES. The facts also show that under a high protective tariff on wool the number of sheep have decreased about from 10,000,000 to 14,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator continues, he will get it at 20,000,000 or 30,000,000.

Mr. JAMES. I am stating the facts.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me, if we had had free wool at that time, the Senator from Utah doubtless would be attributing the decrease of 14,000,000 sheep to free wool.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to continue my answer to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I only desire to say that under the contention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] if there had been a duty on cotton that would have accounted for the fact that

cotton went up from 6 cents at the beginning of that period to about 12 cents at the end of it.

Mr. PITTMAN. What I wish to say to the Senator from Utah is that I am quoting from the Republican gospel; I am quoting from the Republican bible; I am quoting from the Tariff Board report to show that there has been a decrease in the number of sheep in the last 10 years. That is also sustained by the report of the Department of Agriculture. My object in referring to that at the present time is to show that the natural demand for wool and for mutton is increasing and that, without any regard whatever to the tariff, the price must be sustained. So far as concerns the decrease in the number of sheep in the year 1894, I am not referring to any particular instance or to any particular date. I never said that there were not other causes. I know that droughts in New Mexico have killed sheep; I know that snows in Montana have killed sheep; and I know that in Australia in one year approximately one-half of the sheep were killed by a drought. But that does not reach the basic question. The basic proposition is that the ranges of the world are being taken up for more valuable purposes, and when those ranges are so taken up the flocks must decrease.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. It seems to me that on this side of the Chamber we must remember that when a fact does not sustain the protective theory it ceases to be a fact. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that nobody has disputed the fact that there are now fewer sheep than there were a few years ago. No one has denied the fact which the Senator has stated, that the lands in this country are being used for other purposes—that is, certain lands—but there are lands in this country which never can be used for any other purposes than for grazing, and those lands are being utilized, as the Senator says, almost to their limit; but they are not going to grow much less, as every western Senator knows.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I will take pleasure in answering that question later on in my remarks. The Senator admits that the number of sheep are decreasing. If that be a fact, if the supply is decreasing, while there is no question but that the demand is increasing, according to the universal law if the demand is increasing and the supply is decreasing the price must have a tendency to rise. With the demand steadily increasing and the supply rapidly decreasing the competition must be between the buyers instead of the sellers. In such event, the price would be so high that the cost of production in foreign countries would not concern the American woolgrowers. It would simply mean that if another country produced wool for less money it would make a greater profit, but such result would in no way reduce the profit of the American woolgrower, because there would be no competition between sellers and no reason to sell any wool for less than the world's highest market price.

If the supply of wool was greater than the demand for it, then only that wool would be sold which was offered at the lowest price, and the country that could produce it for the least cost would, of course, be able to sell it for the lowest price; but when the demand is greater than the supply, all the wool will be sold and to the purchasers offering the highest price.

Such is the condition of the wool market to-day in Germany, France, England, and other countries where raw wool is admitted free of duty, but in the United States the buyer must pay the market price of the wool with the tariff duty added. For instance, last year the average price paid by the manufacturers in Germany, England, and France for raw scoured wool was 43 cents a pound, while the average price paid by the American manufacturer for scoured wool was 48 cents a pound, being the world's market price of 43 cents with the duty added. The American manufacturer, of course, added the extra price to his manufactured woolen goods, and the American people paid such bonus to the American woolgrower. By removing this duty we reduce the price of woolen goods the amount of such duty and compel the American woolgrower to accept the world's price. While such reduction will be quite large at the present time, the woolgrower can make a reasonable profit at the world's price, and that is all to which he is entitled.

That the world's price will increase is inevitable by reason of the increasing demand and the decreasing supply. If, however, the supply was greater than the demand (which, of course, is not true and is only supposed for the sake of argument) could the American woolgrower then compete in the

markets of the United States with foreign woolgrowers? I say in the markets of the United States because the question of a tariff duty only affects such markets. The determination of this question depends upon the comparative cost of production of wool here and in foreign countries. To obtain the facts necessary to such determination requires a systematic, careful, and impartial investigation and consideration of many subjects and conditions in every wool-producing country in the world, during a long period of time, by disinterested and impartial men who are peculiarly fitted for such work. While no such investigation has been conducted, there are men who have given such subjects careful consideration and lifelong study. There are, in fact, members of the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House who are probably as well versed in such matters as any tariff expert. The Democratic majority in each of these committees in forming the pending tariff bill had the assistance of the best informed statisticians and experts. The fact that such committees have determined that the American woolgrower can compete with the woolgrowers of the world without the protection of a tariff at least shifts to the protectionists the burden of disproving such conclusions. Democrats have the right to rely upon the findings and conclusions of such committees as the highest authorities in their party until the error of such conclusions, if it exists, is proven.

ANALYSIS OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT.

On the other hand, those who contend that the American woolgrower can not compete with the producers of foreign wool without the aid of a protective tariff rely upon the report of the Tariff Board appointed by President Taft in 1911. I have already called attention to the fact that the statistics submitted by experts to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate prove that no duty is required on raw wool to enable the American grower to compete in the markets of the United States, and I now intend to sustain such conclusions by an analysis of the Republican Tariff Board report. In the first place, I do not want it understood that I admit the correctness of such report, because I believe that the report is strongly biased in favor of a high protective tariff, that the board was appointed for the purpose of sustaining President Taft in his opposition to the Underwood tariff bill, which reduced the tariff on raw wool, that the board accepted as true the highest figures given by American sheep raisers as to the cost of production in the United States and the lowest figures given as the cost of production in foreign countries. President Taft, in his message of August 17, 1911, accompanying the veto of the wool bill, says:

My veto was based on the ground that, since the Tariff Board would make, in December, a detailed report on wool and wool manufactures, with special reference to the relation of the existing rates of duties to relative costs here and abroad * * * legislation should not be hastily enacted in the absence of such information.

How did the board proceed to obtain its information? Let us take the board's own statement:

The board has conducted a detailed investigation of the financial aspects of the woolgrowing industry as it now exists in the western United States, in the prosecution of which every effort was made to obtain figures that were both accurate and reliable. In a majority of cases growers had not kept their accounts in such shape as to render the desired information readily obtainable. However, the familiarity of the agents of the board with the industry was such that, with the hearty cooperation of the growers themselves, results were obtained that fairly reflect the general conditions prevailing in that region. * * * From its very nature the inquiry was a difficult one. There seemed to be no uniformity in the accounting methods of those whose operations were under inquiry. * * * The schedules upon which these calculations are based were filled out by agents of the Tariff Board, who personally visited each flockowner.

Such is the manner of obtaining the information upon which to base this report. From whom did they seek the evidence? From the defendants who were under indictment. It is possible that the board believed that the sheep raisers were ignorant of the reasons that prompted the appointment of the board and the uses to which the evidence would be put, and therefore could be surprised into making admissions against their own interests. The cost of the production of wool in the United States from which the conclusions in the report are drawn were obtained "with the hearty cooperation of the growers themselves." The result of this hearty cooperation is apparent in the board's estimate of the cost of raising sheep in the Western States. The report, on page 311, says:

Operating costs are divided in the schedule into miscellaneous costs and costs of labor, forage, shearing, and selling, respectively. But in the tables shearing and selling costs are included under miscellaneous costs.

The items under miscellaneous costs need little explanation. In cases where the industry is carried on under a salaried manager employed by either a company or an individual, a charge for administration is allowed. When the owner devotes himself to the care of his flock he is allowed compensation usually as an item of labor costs, according to the time which he gives and the nature of his services.

The amount allowed is that which he would otherwise have had to pay for the performance of these services. If this allowance had not been made the comparability of the schedules would have been seriously affected.

"The items under miscellaneous expense need little explanation." So says the report. And yet these items, without segregation or detailed computation, are given in the report as about equal to the combined costs of labor and maintenance. And remember that the cost of forage and the feeding of the sheep is included under maintenance and not under miscellaneous charges. It is upon these miscellaneous charges that the board relies to sustain its conclusion that the cost of raising sheep in the United States is greater than in any other country. Yet it says:

The items under miscellaneous expense need little explanation.

The costs of maintenance can not be considered of so much importance in the report, as it is given as only one-fourth of the expense of the industry, while the same report declares that miscellaneous expenses constitute one-half of the total costs. Little effort is made in the report to show that the cost of maintenance is greater in the Western States than in foreign countries, because the public are informed as to the vast ranges on the public domain in the West used by the sheep raisers without hindrance or charge.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean, does he, that the sheepmen have the benefit of all the Government lands without paying for their range privileges?

Mr. PITTMAN. They probably pay a small license fee in different places for the purpose. I believe the reports state that; but I believe all the public ranges are to-day practically monopolized by sheep.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the Senator that it is hardly a nominal figure, as he will see by investigation. It is a pretty large figure.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is included, however, within the maintenance charges, which are only one-quarter of the total expenses of the sheep industry in this country.

The board can hardly contend that the difference in cost of production here and abroad is due to the difference in the cost of labor, because in its report in discussing the expenses of the industry in Australia it says:

Labor, while paid almost as much as in the United States, does not cost so much in the aggregate, because of the paddock system, which enables one man to care for very large numbers of sheep.

The same character of labor, in fact, that is used in all foreign countries is used in most portions of the United States. It is a foreign labor. It is just as cheap a labor, it is just as ignorant a labor, as we find anywhere in the world. As far as offering any protection to the American workingman is concerned, it does not do so, because this cheap foreign labor is imported to many places in this country.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator give us, from his personal knowledge with regard to his own State, the wages of sheep herders?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will give that information to the Senator in a few minutes from those who are even better informed than the Senator from Wyoming or myself.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, that is rather an evasion of the question. I asked the question because I presumed the Senator would know exactly what the herders of sheep and minders of sheep receive in Nevada, as the Senators from each State ought to know about their particular State. I did not intend to be impertinent in my inquiry.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have no doubt the Senator has fixed conclusions with regard to such matters; but I prefer to give to the Senate the report of the assessors and of various sheepmen in my State as to the price they are paying rather than to force my own conclusions upon the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator not to be quoting then from the Tariff Board report, but to be stating that we paid for sheepmen in this country as low wages as were paid in Australia and other countries.

Mr. PITTMAN. What I read was from the Tariff Board report.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, then, does not state that as his own knowledge of wages in his State, but from the Tariff Board report?

Mr. PITTMAN. What I have read is from the Tariff Board report.

Mr. SMOOT. The Tariff Board report does not say that there is as ignorant labor employed in this country as in any other country of the world, and the Tariff Board report does not say that the men are paid as low wages here as in any other country in the world.

Mr. PITTMAN. I read what the Tariff Board report said. I will read it again for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no objection to what the Tariff Board says; it was the statement the Senator made after reading what the Tariff Board says.

Mr. PITTMAN. As the Senator is satisfied with what the Tariff Board says, I will not read it again.

But what is the difference in the number of laborers employed, and what is the cost of building and maintaining these enormous paddocks to fence in millions of sheep? The board calls attention to the paddock system to show that a lesser number of herders is required, but it does not even suggest that such paddocks, in their building and maintenance, add an enormous item to the cost of raising sheep in Australia. If the paddock system were used in the West, the charging of half of the total cost of the industry to miscellaneous expenses might not appear to be such a gross exaggeration. If you do not know the equipment of a sheep ranch, look in the report and you will see it at a glance—a houseless, unfenced range on the free public domain, a sheep herder to every 1,500 sheep, a camp tender to every flock, which may contain from 3,000 to 10,000 head of sheep, a covered wagon to each camp tender, and collie dogs to do the intelligent work.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PITTMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator now reading from the report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I am not reading from the report. I got my information from the report.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator, then, if he observed in reading the report that the final conclusion of the Tariff Board in comparing Australia and this country was that in certain parts of this country it cost 19 cents a pound to raise wool, in certain other parts 11 cents a pound, in certain others 9 and a fraction, but in Australia the profits on the sheep from other sources than wool were such that the wool cost them nothing, and, in fact, they made in many localities in Australia a profit without counting the wool at all?

Mr. PITTMAN. I thank the Senator for that suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. That, of course, the Senator understands, is in the report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and I want the Senator to listen carefully, if he will do me the honor to do so, when I read that portion of the report. I think he will ascertain that they do not state that the mutton pays all the expenses of producing the wool in Australia or in South America. I think the report will show that the mutton in certain parts of the West does pay, with the exception of one-half of 1 per cent, all the expenses of producing the wool.

But returning to the Tariff Board's methods of exaggerating costs. The report says that sometimes it is necessary for the sheep raiser to build bridges across gulches so the sheep can pass from one range to another, and that such necessities add greatly to the miscellaneous expenses. They may exist somewhere, but I have never seen a gulch on the western range that a sheep could not cross, and even the report does not contain a photograph of one of these expensive bridges.

The board, on page 339 of the report, places the wages of herders at \$59.42 and board and extra labor at \$63.02 and board per month in the State of Nevada. Hon. D. F. Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, in reply to a written request for information concerning the sheep industry in Nevada, says:

The wages of such employees (sheep herders and camp tenders) are about \$35 to \$40 per month and keep, amounting to about \$12 to \$14 per month.

It will be observed that the cost of labor as given by the Tariff Board is 58 per cent higher than the same cost as given by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator wish by that to discredit the figures of the Tariff Board on the cost of raising wool and sheep?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have already stated that I think they are very discreditable.

Mr. WARREN. What is the difference between the Senator from Nevada and the Tariff Board on wages, please?

Mr. PITTMAN. The difference is about 58 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. Did I understand that the wages were \$35 or \$30?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will read it again.

Mr. WARREN. Please.

Mr. PITTMAN. The report gives the wages of herders in Nevada as \$59.42 and board; extra labor, \$63.02 and board. The Department of Agriculture, in reply to a recent letter of mine, says:

The wages of such employees (sheep herders and camp tenders) are about \$35 to \$40 per month and keep, amounting to about \$12 to \$14 per month.

Mr. WARREN. That is, the keep is \$12 to \$14 per month?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly give me a reference to the portion of the report where that extraordinary statement is made?

Mr. PITTMAN. On page 339 of the report.

Mr. WALSH. I say "extraordinary." Mr. President, because I am able to speak from actual personal knowledge when I say that sheep herders in the State of Montana get \$5 more than ordinary farm laborers, who are hired by the month and get \$40 a month. The prevailing rate of wages for sheep herders in the State of Montana is from \$40 to \$45 per month. When I heard the statement, I thought there must be some error.

Mr. WARREN. I assume that does not include the "straw bosses," as they are termed, and those who have the care—

Mr. WALSH. The statement does not, either, as I gather it, because it is expressly confined to sheep herders.

Mr. WARREN. As I understand the Senator from Montana, then, the regular wages would be from forty to forty-five dollars. That, of course, is "found," including living expenses; that is, \$40 to \$45 per month in addition to board, lodging, and such like expenses?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly; and the same is true here. The statement is that the figures are based upon a computation of sheep herders getting fifty-nine dollars and some cents a month and "found."

Mr. WARREN. That being true, does the Senator maintain that the Tariff Board sets out that it costs as much for labor in Australia as it does in America?

Mr. PITTMAN. I read the language wherein they stated that.

Mr. WARREN. I will not trouble the Senator further.

Mr. PITTMAN. The county clerk of Humboldt County, one of the largest sheep-producing counties in Nevada, sustains the Secretary of Agriculture in his estimate of the cost of labor. In answer to a letter of inquiry he writes me as follows:

From my observations up to a couple of years ago there were coming into this country a carload of young Basques every year, and their business was sheep herding, and I do not think that they received over \$30 per month for their first year's work, and perhaps in many cases not that much, but after gaining some experience in the work they were probably paid more.

The assessors of the various counties in Nevada, in reply to inquiries made by me, give the wages at from \$35 to \$45 per month. Hon. Ben W. Coleman, judge of the ninth judicial district court of the State of Nevada, a man who is most highly respected in the State for his learning, ability, and integrity, writes the following letter with reference to the sheep industry in Nevada:

NINTH DISTRICT COURT CHAMBERS,
BEN W. COLEMAN, DISTRICT JUDGE,
Ely, Nev., May 31, 1913.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yours of the 24th received. The assessor has not completed the assessment for this year, consequently I inclose statement for 1912 from his records.

I also inclose a clipping from the Journal, which you may have already. I do not believe the statement which has been made by the Sheep Growers' Association is reliable. Three years ago I bought a sheep ranch, and before doing so I inquired extensively as to the expense of running sheep, and from all the information received I found that the expense was about \$1 per head. I note that their statement is expense of running, "including losses," \$2.50 per head. I believe that \$1.50 per head, including losses, is ample, and that \$1.75 would be greatly in excess. I reach these conclusions after careful and extensive investigation.

Their statement also shows "that 80 per cent of the ewes lamb." This is a low estimate. Many of the ewes have twins. A flock of good, strong, healthy sheep run as high sometimes as 115 per cent. I was told by a very prominent sheepman here a little over a year ago that the report or figures given the men representing the Tariff Commission were not reliable and made in favor of the sheepmen.

I am not prejudiced against the sheep industry, as I am the half owner of a 700-acre sheep ranch and of 2,000 acres of grazing land, and my selfish interest is in keeping up the price of wool and mutton.

It has occurred to me that I might give you some idea as to the wages paid herders. The average herder earns about \$35 per month. If a man is in the business on a large scale he usually employs a camp tender, who earns about \$50 per month. The camp tender generally cares for two herds. He is the man, as you probably know, who goes out to the herder's camp about twice a week with salt, provisions, etc. A small rancher, or a man with one herd, usually acts as his own camp tender. As you said in your letter, a large percentage of the herders are Basques. They are practically all foreigners.

If I think of anything further of interest on the subject, will write you. Call upon me whenever I can serve you.

I think you are taking the right stand. Best wishes.

Sincerely,

BEN W. COLEMAN.

The board, on page 330 of the report, gives the average net income from the capital invested in the wool business in the Western States to be only 6.2 per cent, while on page 10 it states that the prevailing rates of interest throughout the western woolgrowing States are from 8 to 10 per cent. It is, indeed, strange that a man would remain in an industry, attended with all the risks portrayed by the board when he can lend his

money on gilt-edged security without danger or worry and earn a greater income. Again, if the business will earn only 6.2 per cent on the capital invested, how could a man borrow money at from 8 to 10 per cent to start, enlarge, or carry on such business? And if money can not be borrowed for such purposes—and certainly no one would lend upon a business that could not even earn the interest—how does the board account for the fact that it is a common occurrence for men to start in with a few hundred sheep and increase them to thousands in a few years? How does it explain the remarkable growth of fortunes in such industry within the last few years?

The board in its effort to exaggerate the costs of the industry has reduced its computations of profits to an absurdity. There is no doubt that the costs are much less and the profits much greater than are estimated in the report. The board in arriving at the cost of producing wool subtracts the receipts from all sources, except wool, which is principally mutton, from the total costs of the sheep business and the balance is the cost of producing the wool. This they designate as net charge against wool. For instance, if the mutton should sell for enough to pay all the expenses of the sheep industry, there would be no net charge against the wool and the price received for the wool would be all profit. The Tariff Board admits that the net charge against wool in South America is from 4 to 5 cents a pound, and in Australia somewhat less.

I ask the Senator from Utah if I am correct in that?

Mr. SMOOT. The Tariff Board report says a few cents less. It says the amount of charge against the wool is a few cents in Australia.

While I am on my feet, I may have misunderstood the Senator in referring to the Tariff Board report on page 339. Did I understand the Senator to say the report shows that they paid \$59.42 per month for herders in Nevada?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator at some time say that that amount included the board and expenses of maintaining the herder?

Mr. PITTMAN. I did. My reason for stating that is that the board in its general report states that they do pay the herders and furnish them their keep.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, of course, the conclusion the Senator reaches is certainly wrong, because he said there was a difference between \$40 and \$60 of 50 per cent, which is true. I am sure the Senator did not want Senators to understand that you can hire a herder in Nevada for \$35 or \$40 without his board.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand that is the price they pay.

Mr. SMOOT. With board?

Mr. PITTMAN. And give him his board. I understand that when fixing the herder's salary they include his board. But if the Senator from Utah does not so understand it I am willing to accept his conclusion and subtract the cost of board from the \$59, and it will substantiate what I have already said as to the cost of labor.

Mr. SMOOT. I take it the Senator would say that to board a man in the West as sheep herder would cost at least \$20 a month.

Mr. PITTMAN. The reports we have from the Agricultural Department say not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not run sheep for a good many years. I do not own a head now. I have run a great many herds of sheep in my life. I assure the Senator I never hired a foreman for less than from \$75 to \$90 per month, and that was back in 1890. I paid Mr. Thomas Thompson as foreman \$85 at that time, and I am quite sure that the Senator will admit that to-day that amount is paid in Nevada or in Utah.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will say to the Senator that I know of my own personal knowledge that the wages run between \$35 and \$45, and a foreman gets about \$50 a month. I also want to state that those range herds in Nevada sometimes contain from 12,000 to 20,000 sheep under one foreman, and I would not be surprised that the foreman the Senator from Utah refers to had charge of a vast number of sheep.

Mr. SMOOT. No; never that number. I wish to say that as far as my own State is concerned we have no large herds of sheep there now. The number has been cut down by the Forest Service until there are very few sheep owned by any one man.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIVELY. I only wanted to inquire of the Senator from Utah if he would infer from his own experience in this

matter and from the report of the Tariff Board that the wages have gone down 25 or 30 per cent in the last few years?

Mr. SMOOT. I know nothing about that. I did not infer any such thing. The question came up as to what is paid to a herder in the State of Nevada. I only wanted to know if the figures included the board and expenses of maintaining the herder.

Mr. SHIVELY. Did the Senator's figure also include the board?

Mr. SMOOT. It did.

Mr. SHIVELY. From \$75 to \$90?

Mr. SMOOT. Not for the herder. Mr. Thompson was not a herder. He was foreman. In the Tariff Board report the wage of a foreman is given at \$111.

Mr. SHIVELY. Is there any other question the Senator desires to ask?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from Nevada asked me a question in the beginning, and I answered it.

Mr. PITTMAN. The board does not attempt to substantiate these figures nor to show that it has obtained sufficient facts upon which to base the estimate. The best estimates place an average net charge against the principal foreign wools at 5 cents per pound.

But I am willing to accept the net charges placed in the Tariff Board report against the production of foreign wool, which is from 4 to 5 cents more on South American wool and a few cents more on Australian wool.

COMPARISON OF TRANSPORTATION COSTS.

The average rate of transportation for foreign wool to the American markets is about one-half a cent more than for the transportation from the Western States to the same markets.

Mr. SMOOT. More?

Mr. PITTMAN. More.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator must know that the freight rate from Nevada to Boston or Philadelphia or any other eastern wool market is a great deal higher than the freight rate from Australia to those markets.

Mr. PITTMAN. But I am taking the importations covering a long period of time and the various grades of wool of all countries coming into this country.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator means the freight charge?

Mr. PITTMAN. I mean the freight charge.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the freight charge on wool to-day from Australia to Boston or Philadelphia is about \$8 a ton, and that is higher than it has been. That is 40 cents a hundred. The Senator knows that there can not be a hundred pounds of wool shipped from Nevada to Boston for less than \$1.92. So, Mr. President, there is one cent and a half a pound against the western grower on transportation.

Mr. PITTMAN. I said that the importation on wool into this country shows that it has cost half a cent more a pound than from the interior of this country to various markets, and I am prepared to show that at a later period of time. I should like to have the Senator from Utah at any other time discuss that particular question, if he sees fit. I make that as a statement based upon the computations of the Tariff Board and upon other statistics now presented.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I can not let that pass without putting my word against that of the Senator. As I read the Tariff Board report, and as I know from personal experience, it is often as low as \$8, sometimes higher, from Australia. The rate from Argentina oftentimes is 16 and 17 cents a hundred, while from the Rocky Mountain States the average is probably \$1.75. I think higher. In many western places the rate is \$1.98.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THOMAS. With the Senator's permission, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether the freight on wool is not higher from his State and from mine to the Boston market than it is from the Pacific coast?

Mr. WARREN. It is; but not from Montana or the Rocky Mountain States.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand, but I am talking about our States.

Mr. WARREN. It is very much higher from San Francisco to Boston than it is from Australia or South America.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be; but at this juncture I simply want to emphasize the fact, as I have done on several other oc-

cations, that the issues which are here involved are very largely a matter of freight rates, and that the interior of this country, which has not even potential competition, is made the victim of the transportation rates on every commodity which we produce.

Mr. WARREN. Now, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. THOMAS. And it is that growing and absolutely indefensible evil as much, if not more than the matter of tariff rates, that causes our section of the country to suffer as it does.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator cited that wool has cost \$1.72 a hundred for freight from the capital of the Senator's State and from the capital of mine until very lately, when, by a ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it has been reduced to \$1.32. But we can not get away from the fact that all freight from foreign countries is bound to be lower than the rate at which any railroad can haul across the country, because of water transportation facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not disputing that.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have to decline to yield further. I am always willing to yield for a reply to questions, but I really do not like to impose upon the Senate and the Finance Committee by allowing this matter to drag. The Senators may discuss this question between themselves.

I want to state now that I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. The question of freight rates could hardly be considered in this question at the present time to any particular extent, as we know that the rates are changing all the time. But I simply want to suggest to the Senator from Utah that all the wool in Australia is not raised in the town of Sydney. It is raised just as far in the interior

as our wool is raised, and it costs them just as much to get it to the seaports of Australia and the seaports of Argentina as it costs us to get it from the interior of the West to the seaports of our own country.

Mr. SMOOT. The same is true, I may say, in relation to our wool. It is not all produced where a railroad is, and it will have to be transported to a railroad.

Now, Mr. President, the tariff report says:

The general freight from the seacoast of New Zealand to London is reported as averaging \$3 per bale.

That is what the Tariff Board report says.

Mr. PITTMAN. Now, Mr. President, they take the freight rates from the port of Australia or the port of South America to another port on our coast, and they do not take into consideration the interior transportation of these countries at all, whereas, as a matter of fact, the interior transportation of those countries is more primitive than ours and more expensive than ours, and we place our wool practically at the market of this country on the coast at the same rate that they place in Australia the wool from the interior on the coast of Australia and Argentina.

TARIFF BOARD STATISTICS SUSTAIN FREE RAW WOOL.

On page 330 of the report is a tabulation showing by States total receipts and expenditures, capital per head, selling price of wool per pound, and net charges against wool per pound of flocks investigated by the Tariff Board in the western United States. I will not read the tabulation, but will ask leave to have it printed in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE X.—Showing, by States, total receipts and expenditures, capital per head, selling price of wool per pound, and net charge against wool per pound, of flocks investigated by Tariff Board in the western United States.

States.	Number of sheep.	Pounds of wool.	Receipts.			Expenditures.				Net charge against wool per pound.	Selling price per pound.	Capital per head.	Rate of income on capital.
			Wool.	Other sources.	Total.	Labor.	Maintenance.	Miscellaneous and selling expense.	Total.				
Arizona.....	180,254	1,181,882	\$184,211.65	\$246,923.23	\$431,134.88	\$141,612.16	\$26,566.15	\$204,216.08	\$372,394.39	\$0.106	\$0.155	\$5.64	5.8
California.....	115,192	994,687	145,018.66	198,881.05	343,899.71	63,477.17	93,256.82	113,755.55	270,489.54	.071	.145	5.18	12.3
Colorado.....	333,526	2,110,189	300,363.13	402,245.42	702,608.55	198,695.23	88,642.45	299,268.32	586,006.00	.087	.142	4.59	7.6
Idaho.....	377,919	2,340,483	424,567.47	708,954.48	1,133,521.95	258,826.93	364,205.34	491,558.27	1,114,590.54	.173	.181	6.13	8
Montana.....	514,957	3,515,417	649,455.46	568,063.24	1,217,518.70	278,993.71	275,320.64	501,514.10	1,055,828.45	.138	.184	5.57	5.6
Nevada.....	163,255	1,011,046	153,810.31	321,792.64	475,602.95	123,372.41	59,341.56	180,901.47	363,615.44	.041	.152	6.08	11.3
New Mexico.....	442,142	2,613,976	364,350.12	508,043.29	872,393.41	245,427.12	79,138.02	402,783.53	727,348.72	.083	.139	4.56	7.2
Oregon.....	229,713	1,678,993	237,000.35	272,476.51	509,476.86	129,025.90	143,723.14	183,571.01	456,320.05	.109	.141	4.92	4.7
Utah.....	265,645	1,901,436	330,782.52	424,186.13	754,968.65	182,114.75	100,875.54	318,869.68	601,839.97	.093	.173	5.79	9.9
Washington.....	61,574	391,776	46,540.70	133,420.00	179,960.70	45,342.10	38,293.92	47,465.27	131,101.29	+.005	.118	4.58	17.3
Wyoming.....	467,524	3,024,828	475,739.44	599,652.89	1,075,392.33	336,991.56	168,455.18	471,887.22	977,333.96	.124	.157	5.19	4.0
Total.....	3,151,731	20,764,713	3,311,839.81	4,384,638.88	7,696,478.69	2,003,879.04	1,437,818.76	3,215,790.55	6,657,488.35	.109	.159	5.30	6.2

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply want to read, however, the different costs of production in wool in the Western States as they will affect the same States. Here are the net charges: Arizona, 10 cents a pound; California, 7 cents; Colorado, 8 cents; Idaho, 17 cents; Montana, 13 cents; Nevada, 4 cents; New Mexico, 8 cents; Oregon, 10 cents; Utah, 9 cents; Washington, one-half cent a pound; and Wyoming, 12 cents a pound.

Now, let me read why that difference occurs in the cost of raising wool in these Western States. Nearly every one of those States was grouped with some western sheep-raising State. The report says, at page 371:

The wide variation from Table XIII to Table XVIII in the net charge against wool depends in the main upon certain conditions which have already been discussed—the particular sort of flock kept, whether crossbred or pure wool; whether woolgrowing is combined with breeding; the importance for different purposes of the annual increase of lambs; the extent to which wethers are kept; the amount and quality of wool produced; and the methods employed in the farm operations.

Since the only source of regular income from wethers is wool, and the costs of maintenance are not materially lower than for breeding ewes, it is evident that though the fleece of the wethers may be superior to that of the ewes, the higher the proportion of wethers in a flock, the greater is likely to be the net charge against wool, since under the conditions now prevailing in this region the tables indicate that the fleece of a sheep alone does not pay for its maintenance.

The net charge for the production of wool in a foreign country being 5 cents a pound, the wool in the State of Nevada and the State of Washington requires no duty, because the net charge against the wool in those States is placed at less than 5 cents a pound by the Tariff Board.

If for the sake of argument we admit that there is no net charge against the wool in foreign countries, then the State of Washington will still require no duty to enable it to compete,

because, as shown in the table, there is only one-half a cent a pound net charge against the wool in that State, and that would be offset by the greater freight rates on foreign wool. The report admits that Washington State requires no duty on its wool, that the receipts from other sources—which means mutton—are sufficient, lacking one-half cent per pound, to pay all expenses of the sheep industry. And remember, that this estimate is based on the exaggerated costs that the board has charged against the industry in the United States. In other words, the report admits that the cost of producing wool in Washington is only one-half of 1 cent per pound, while the same report shows that the cost of producing wool in South America is from 4 to 5 cents a pound, and a little less in Australia than in South America.

Why is Washington State in better condition to compete with foreign woolgrowers than the other woolgrowing States of the West? Can the other States place themselves in the same favorable position as the State of Washington? A careful study of the table will make clear the answer to both questions. It will be observed that Washington has no advantage over the other States in the matter of the cost of production of the wool, and receives a smaller price for its wool than is received in most of the Western States. Let us compare the industry in Montana and Wyoming, the two greatest producers of wool in the United States, with the State of Washington, where it is admitted by the board that the receipts from other sources besides wool practically pay all expenses of the sheep industry, leaving wool as a total profit.

The report gives the following cost per head for raising sheep in such States: The cost of the labor is, in Montana, 54 cents; in Wyoming, 72 cents; in Washington, 74 cents. So the cost of the labor is greatest in Washington. The cost of maintenance

is, in Montana, 54 cents; in Wyoming, 36 cents; and in Washington, 62 cents. So the cost of maintenance is greatest in Washington. This shows that the cost of labor and maintenance is greater in Washington than in either Montana or Wyoming. The miscellaneous cost is, in Montana, 97 cents; in Wyoming, \$1.01; and in Washington, 77 cents. It appears from a comparison of these miscellaneous expenses that the cooperation of the woolgrowers in Montana and Wyoming was more hearty than in Washington. Yet, in spite of this, the report shows that the total cost of raising a sheep in Montana or Wyoming is less than in the State of Washington. The report gives the total cost of raising a sheep in each of such States as follows: Montana, \$2.05; Wyoming, \$2.09; and in the State of Washington, \$2.13. And although it costs more to raise sheep in Washington than in Montana or Wyoming, Washington earns an income of 17.3 per cent on the industry, while Montana earns but 5.6 per cent and Wyoming only 4 per cent, according to the report. It is apparent that the difference in profits is not due to the costs, and therefore must be due to the difference in the receipts. Washington receives no more for its wool, and therefore its increased receipts must come from some other source. By computation, based upon the tabulation hereinbefore set out, we find that the receipts per sheep for wool was, in Montana, \$1.261; in Wyoming, \$1.017; and in Washington, \$0.756; while the receipts from other sources per sheep were: In Montana, \$1.103; Wyoming, \$1.282; and Washington, \$2.167.

In other words, Montana received \$2.36 for each sheep; Wyoming, \$2.30; and Washington, \$2.92 for each sheep. The increased price for the Washington sheep is due to the fact that Washington received nearly twice as much for its mutton in each sheep as was received by either Montana or Wyoming.

Take Nevada, for instance. This State stands next to Washington, as is shown by the report, for the low net charge against the production of wool, and is accredited in such report with earning 11.3 per cent income on the investment. This is undoubtedly an underrating of the income, as we know, by reason of the gross exaggeration of the mythical miscellaneous costs; but it serves the purpose of comparison. Nevada, next to Washington, has the largest proportion of mutton sheep. The report shows that receipts for each sheep raised in Nevada are 94 cents from wool and \$1.97 from mutton. In other words, comparing Nevada with Montana and Wyoming, we find that Nevada receives for each sheep practically as much for its wool, while for the mutton product of each sheep it receives nearly twice as much as does either Montana or Wyoming.

The board, in discussing the tendency toward the raising of mutton sheep, calls attention to the fact that in Washington and Nevada, where the net charges against wool are recorded as the smallest, there are in use on the ranges the largest number of mutton rams. In Montana, Wyoming, and those other States where the profit on the investment is given in the report as the smallest, the sheep raiser sacrifices the mutton qualities of the sheep for the improvement of the wool, while the sheep raiser in Washington and Nevada devotes more attention to the production of mutton. In the former case, wool is treated as the principal product and mutton the by-product, while in the latter case mutton is considered as the principal product and wool as the by-product. The necessity for the sheep raiser to give more consideration to the production of mutton is recognized by the board, for it says in its report, at page 343:

MUTTON AN IMPORTANT FACTOR.

These figures indicate that under present conditions sheep raising can not be profitably carried on for the sake of the wool alone, and that if the industry is to prosper the receipts from mutton must cover a large part of the costs. The loss incurred in exclusive wool production is the result of two causes: (1) The gradual encroachment of agriculture on grazing lands and the consequent great increase in the costs of sheep growing, and (2) the gradual decline of wool values.

The decline in the profits of wool production has, however, been accompanied by an increase in the demand for mutton, resulting from the fact that the production of pork and beef has not kept pace with the growth of population.

But the number of sheep received at Chicago stockyards has constantly and rapidly increased, having passed the receipts from cattle in 1894 and being at the present time almost equal to the receipts of hogs. These figures are embodied in the following table:

	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1911 (estimated).
Sheep.....	350,000	336,000	2,180,000	3,550,000	5,229,000	5,668,000
Cattle.....	533,000	1,382,000	3,484,000	2,729,000	3,053,000	2,920,000
Hogs.....	1,690,000	7,060,000	7,660,000	8,109,000	5,587,000	7,031,000

But these figures do not fully indicate the increase in the receipts of mutton as compared with those of beef and pork, since the average weight of sheep has been increasing, while that of cattle and hogs, respectively, has declined.

The annual consumption of sheep and lambs in the United States at the present time is thought to be about 17,000,000 head, representing a total weight of about 630,000,000 pounds. The average weight of the lambs marketed at Chicago is about 70 pounds and that of mature sheep about 100 pounds, and they dress about 50 per cent and 48 per cent, respectively. The important place which mutton holds to-day among meats is further shown by the fact that in the year 1910 Great Britain imported, principally from Australia and South America, 589,000,000 pounds of refrigerated mutton and 16,832,704 pounds of preserved mutton, making a total of 605,832,704 pounds.

The receipts from other sources amount approximately on an average per head to \$1.39 in the Western States, \$0.93 in Australia, and \$0.84 in South America, and constitute approximately in the United States 54.3 per cent, in Australia 41.3 per cent, and in South America 39.6 per cent of the total receipts. And they cover approximately in the United States 65.9 per cent, in Australia 98.9 per cent, and in South America 73 per cent of the total costs.

That receipts from other sources are largely derived from the sale of mutton is attributable to the fact that for some years the sheep industry of our western region has not been expanding; indeed, during the last 18 months there has been a sharp decline in the total number of sheep. A large percentage, ranging normally from 70 per cent to 80 per cent, of the sheep annually placed on the market are lambs, because it does not ordinarily pay to run wethers for their wool, and the grower retains only enough lambs to replace the unserviceable ewes which he annually culls from his flock. The price of mutton has varied at the Chicago stock yards but slightly for a number of years, as shown in the following table, which gives the average prices paid in the Chicago market from 1907 to 1911, inclusive:

	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911
Wethers.....	\$5.74	\$5.14	\$5.58	\$5.46	\$4.22
Lambs.....	7.19	6.11	7.34	7.56	6.00
Ewes.....	5.19	4.88	4.88	5.19	3.75

The declines shown in 1911 are attributed to heavy liquidation on the part of western growers. It would appear that in normal times the annual receipts from mutton have remained fairly uniform during this period, but unless there is some marked change in conditions no material increase of this amount is to be expected in normal years.

In Australia the receipts from mutton constitute a much smaller proportion of the receipts from other sources. This is partly due to the fact that the great sheep runs of the interior are unfavorably situated as regards marketing, but in a larger measure to the fact that these growers place greater emphasis on the production of wool than on that of mutton, and run their flocks accordingly, as evidenced by their custom of keeping large numbers of wethers for their wool. In New South Wales, for example, wethers constitute over one-half of all the sheep kept.

Mr. President, I can not refrain from again calling attention to this significant language used in the report:

These figures indicate that under present conditions sheep raising can not be profitably carried on for the sake of wool alone, and that if the industry is to prosper the receipts for mutton must cover a large part of the cost.

The sheep raisers in the State of Washington and in the State of Nevada have already recognized this necessity, and the receipts for mutton in those States practically pay all the costs of raising sheep, leaving the wool as a net profit.

Mr. Bennett, the editor of the Wool and Cotton Reporter and a well-known expert on wool, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, said:

The main objection to the duty on wool is not only that it hampers the manufacturers, but it hampers a proper sheep husbandry in the United States. The people of the United States are very fond of lamb, roast lamb, lamb chops, and lamb in every form, but there is not the desire in this country for heavy mutton that there is abroad in England and France and elsewhere. There have never been half enough lambs produced in this country to supply the demand. During the past year there has been something in the sheep and wool business of the United States approaching what we call a liquidation in the stock market—there has been a liquidation of sheep, due to the scarcity of pork and mutton, and I do not know that anybody knows to how low a point the supply of sheep and lambs in the United States has been reduced.

If we had free wool and the enormous political atmosphere which has surrounded the sheep husbandry was removed, instead of producing 50 per cent of the lambs in the United States we would produce 100 per cent. They do in England. They have twins enough to offset the male sheep and their losses in other directions, and they produce 100 per cent. The demand exists in this country for 100 per cent of lambs, but the attention of the farmer has been directed to such an extent to wool that they have never developed in that direction as they should.

I have been familiar with the woolgrowing in the West and sheep husbandry in the West for 35 years, and it is astonishing the extent to which they keep what they call dry sheep—that is, wethers, or denaturalized male sheep. They could sell them as lambs for \$7; they keep them for three years, and have to sell them as full-grown sheep for three or four dollars, for the sake of the wool. I maintain that it will not be difficult for this committee to satisfy itself that with free wool and the proper development of the sheep husbandry in the United States more sheep will be kept than to-day, and it will be a growing industry instead of a decadent industry.

I want to call attention right now to the fact that the very conditions against which the board complains exist to a greater extent in those States where the net charges placed by the board against wool were the greatest and to a lesser extent in those States where the charges were the least. The board's report and tabulations show that the State of Washington produces the greatest percentage of lambs of any Western State, and that the State of Nevada produces the next greatest percentage of lambs of any Western State. The report also shows that the States of Washington and Nevada carry a smaller

percentage of wethers than nearly all of the other Western States, carrying out the theory brought forward by the Tariff Board, and showing the western sheep raisers how they can have wool as a clear profit if they will continue their industry according to scientific views or as the nature of the country demands.

Let the sheep raisers of Montana, Wyoming, and the other Western States, who are crying for a protective tariff on wool, pay more attention to the raising of sheep for mutton and they will have no more need for such tariff than the States of Nevada and Washington.

IS IT A DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE PRODUCER?

Mr. President, I will answer but briefly the next complaint against this provision of the bill: Is the placing of raw wool on the free list a discrimination against the producer because some duty is still maintained upon the manufactured article of which raw wool is a constituent part?

The complaint is based upon a theory of protection, and therefore I intend to discuss it from such viewpoint. As I understand, the recently declared theory of protection is that the tariff upon a foreign article should equal the difference of the cost of production at home and in a foreign country. I have already proven by Republican statistics that the cost of the wool industry is no greater here than abroad, so raw wool, under the Republican theory, is not entitled to protection.

The manufactured article might or might not bear the same relation to a similar article abroad, but the raw material, if it did not come within the rule, certainly, under the Republican protective theory, would not be entitled to a protective tariff on the sole ground that a duty was placed upon the manufactured article. I do not understand that such a theory has ever been presented by any protectionist. If such theory were put into force and effect, then it would be essential to have a duty on every article, both raw and manufactured, whether it required the aid of protection or not. The Republican Party has never recognized such a theory, as every tariff bill that it has prepared has placed many articles upon the free list, and principally the raw articles.

If one industry can exist without the aid of a tariff duty, and those engaged in such industry believe in the system of protection at all, I can not see how they would have cause for complaint because a less-favored industry received only sufficient aid to preserve its existence.

The only possible excuse for the retention of any duty upon the importation of an article, other than that of raising revenue, is to prevent its destruction by reason of foreign competition. If the producers of raw wool do not believe that the manufacturers of articles containing wool require the protection of a duty to prevent their destruction, let them bring the evidence of such fact before this Democratic administration, and a way will be found, I confidently believe, to raise the necessary revenue from some other source and to place such manufactured articles also on the free list. I have not made any careful study of the tariff as affecting manufactured articles, but I do know that the sheep-raising industry does not require the aid of any tariff duty to enable it to compete in the markets of the world. But whenever I have the information that convinces me that the tariff can be entirely taken off of manufactured articles that are necessary to the comfort of the masses of the people, I intend to use my utmost endeavors to have such articles placed on the free list.

The only discrimination of which we hear complaint from the producers of raw wool is the alleged discrimination against such producers in favor of the manufacturers. They seem to think that the only ones to be considered are the producers and the manufacturers. It does not occur to them that the consumers, who are a hundred times greater in numbers than both the producers and manufacturers of wool together, should be taken into consideration. In determining whether a tariff bill discriminated against a State, we must determine whether it is a benefit or an injury to the greatest number in the State. In my State the producers have benefited by a duty on raw wool, and the consumers have been correspondingly injured. All the people are consumers, while less than two-fifths of 1 per cent of the population of my State are engaged in raising wool, and all the persons engaged in the industry, including owners and laborers, constitute less than 2 per cent of our population.

WILL IT INJURE THE WOOLGROWING STATES?

Mr. President, I now come to the last contention of those opposed to placing raw wool on the free list, viz, that it will injure the woolgrowing States.

It is contended by the woolgrowers that the bill will reduce the price of wool and thereby reduce the profits of the industry, even if it does not destroy such industry. I admit that the

price of wool will be reduced, but I believe that reasonable profits can be maintained in the manner I have hereinbefore discussed. But, for the sake of argument, suppose in the reduction of the price of wool the profits of the sheep industry are reduced, will the State thereby be benefited or injured? This naturally leads us to a consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of the industry to the State, and who are benefited and who are injured by a duty on raw wool.

ADVANTAGES OF THE INDUSTRY.

There were, according to the census of 1910, 1,154,795 sheep in the State of Nevada, valued at \$5,101,328, of which 329,920 were lambs, leaving 824,875 sheep, exclusive of lambs. These sheep are owned, according to the report of the Nevada tax commission, by 314 individuals and corporations. The number of employees in the industry is not given in the census report nor in any other report on the industries of the State, and consequently must be estimated. The Tariff Board on page 593 says:

On one of the largest sheep ranches in Idaho, on the other hand, 2 men—1 herder and 1 camp tender—are employed per each 3,000 head of ewes and 1,500 ewes with their lambs, an average of 1 laborer to 1,500 head, and during lambing 3 men are employed to 1,000 ewes.

Taking a laborer to every 1,500 ewes with their lambs, we find that by dividing 824,875 sheep, being all of the sheep exclusive of the lambs, by 1,500 we get a result of 549 laborers necessary to the industry. During the lambing season and the shearing season extra labor must be employed. This is estimated to mean about 850 extra men for one month during the lambing season, or 70 extra men for the 12 months. About 200 extra men are required for 6 weeks during the shearing season, which would be an average of 22 extra men during the whole year for the purpose of shearing. Now, if we allow a foreman for each sheep owner in the State, there would be 314 foremen. This gives the total labor employed by the sheep industry of the State of Nevada at 955 men for the year around. This is undoubtedly greater than the actual number, because in many instances the owners of the sheep are Basque sheep herders, who act as their own herders, their own foremen, and their own shearers. In other words, the Basque sheep herder, with 1,500 sheep, performs all the labor with regard to such sheep without any assistance.

The advantages, therefore, of the industry to the State are that it brings into the State annually, according to the report of the Nevada Sheep and Woolgrowers' Association, \$568,800 and furnishes labor to 955 men.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE INDUSTRY.

To understand the disadvantages of the industry to the State a general consideration of the conditions existing in the State must be had.

In the first place, it is not one of the chief industries of the State and, in fact, is of small concern by comparison with the other great industries. The cattle industry of the State is engaged in by 2,548 farmers and is valued at \$19,071,809, while the sheep industry is engaged in by only 314 concerns and is only valued at \$5,101,328. The horse industry of the State is engaged in by 2,465 farmers and is valued at \$3,770,402. Every farmer in the State is engaged in raising agricultural crops, of a value of \$5,924,000 annually. The annual output of the manufacturing industries of the State is \$11,887,000, and employs 2,527 men at an average wage of \$75 per month.

The mining industry of the State, as shown by the census report of 1910, shows a value of mining properties of \$156,607,108, with an annual production of \$23,271,597. According to these statistics, there were employed in the mining industry 5,572 wage earners, who received \$8,535,539 for the year 1909.

In determining the relative importance of an industry, it is also necessary to determine the possibilities of the enlargement of such industry. The mining industry in the last 10 years has increased from an annual production in 1899 of \$3,209,457 to \$23,271,579 in 1909. The estimate of the Geological Survey for 1912 reaches the magnificent sum of \$38,358,732. While there is no estimate as to labor, it must have increased proportionately. This industry is a growing industry, and gives every indication that it will increase in the next 10 years as much, if not more, than it has increased in the past 10 years.

The manufacturing industries of the State have just commenced to attract the attention of our people and are increasing at a phenomenal rate. The condition is such that the continued growth of these industries can not be doubted. With all the metals used in the manufactures within its own borders, traversed by two great transportation companies with a local market of vast area, and water power equal to any in the world, the encouragement for the establishment of factories is unsurpassed.

Nevada is destined to be a great agricultural State. Within its borders are 70,285,440 acres of land, 20,000,000 acres of

which are of the most fertile soil, capable of raising anything that may be raised in a temperate or semitropical zone. The State is divided into a system of valleys by chains of mountain ranges running north and south. These valleys in the northern part of the State have an average altitude of about 5,000 feet and gradually slope toward the south until in places they reach a point near sea level. The distance from the northern part of the State to the southern part is approximately 300 miles; and within this range we find a variation of agricultural products from wheat, grain, and hay in the northern and central portions of the State to fruits, melons, and vegetables in its southern portion. I realize that in the opinion of the great majority of people who have not visited our State it is largely a barren waste. I will admit that but a few years ago vast areas were considered by our own people to be practically worthless, by reason of the lack of water, that to-day are raising magnificent crops under the stimulus of irrigation. But a few years ago the water supply in the State was considered as limited to the few streams and springs within its borders, but to-day we have under way great governmental irrigation projects that will bring under cultivation 1,232,142 acres of that land which in the past has been referred to as a barren waste. It has been discovered that all our valleys are underlaid with running water, in many instances but a few feet from the surface; in fact, our great valleys are now known to be but river channels, filled with rich soil that has come down from the mountains through the ages. In addition to this water supply, available artesian water has been discovered in every portion of the State, and there is every reason to believe that land that is not subject to irrigation by means of irrigation projects and pumping wells will receive an ample supply of water from artesian sources.

For the purpose of encouraging the homesteading of this latter class of land I have had the honor to introduce in this body a bill amending the homestead laws of the United States allowing homesteaders on such land to be permitted to reside off of their homesteads until sufficient water can be developed for domestic uses. Another bill has just been introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Idaho which provides that the work of developing water on such lands and fencing the same shall be accepted in lieu of the requirements that so much of the land be cultivated each year. These acts will greatly stimulate the homesteading of these lands, and in our State we have between ten and fifteen millions of acres subject to homesteading under such provisions.

Farmers of our State, as is shown by the census report, nearly all raise cattle and horses, while very few of them raise any sheep except for their domestic use for mutton. The American farmer comes naturally to the raising of cattle and horses, and he has no superior on earth, while the sheep industry, with its cheap labor, seems to require the most ignorant, the most unprogressive, and the lowest type of foreign labor. It is the custom of the farmer in our valleys to range his cattle and horses on the adjacent mountain side while raising and harvesting his hay, and then to drive them within his inclosure, fatten them upon the grass and the hay, and drive them to market. Since the sheep industry has monopolized the range of the State of Nevada the farmer finds it difficult to pursue this system of raising cattle and horses. Down each side of the valleys, along the mountain ranges adjacent to these farms, come thousands upon thousands of sheep, driven by Basque sheep herders and collie dogs, uprooting the vegetation, breaking down fences, destroying roads, obliterating ranges, defiling the water-courses, and driving the cattle and horses of the farmer off of their natural ranges. Such are some of the disadvantages of the sheep industry to the State of Nevada.

There is no opportunity to further enlarge the sheep industry in the State of Nevada, because, as is stated by the Tariff Board, the ranges of the West are already overstocked. But there is ample room to increase the number of farms and to increase the number of the farmers' cattle and horses if the sheep are not permitted to longer monopolize the public domain, the springs, the wells, and the watercourses of the State. I not only believe in placing wool on the free list, but I believe in the establishment of such regulations over the public domain that every farmer will be insured in the use of a reasonable range adjacent to his farm.

WHO IS BENEFITED AND WHO IS INJURED?

Now let us see who is benefited by the sheep industry and who is injured.

Three hundred and fourteen sheep owners would be directly benefited by a duty on raw wool, by being able to sell to the American people their product by an increased price equal to the amount of the duty.

There would be injured by such duty over 80,000 people in my State, who would be compelled to pay the increased price for their woolen goods for the purpose of granting this benefit to the 314 sheep owners.

An examination of the assessors' returns from the various counties in the State will show that between 80 and 90 per cent of the sheep are owned by a very few men in the State and by institutions and individuals who do not reside in the State at all. For instance, the reports of Mr. A. A. Burke, the sheriff, and Mr. John Hayes, the assessor, of Washoe County, two of the most capable officers of the State, disclose that 26 per cent of the sheep in Washoe County are owned by residents of the State of California; that of the 41 owners of sheep in Washoe County 18 are residents of California; that of the 74 per cent of the sheep in Washoe County which are owned by residents of that county 4 institutions own over one-half, or, to be exact, these 4 sheep owners own 59 per cent of the sheep owned in Washoe County.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Is it not also measurably true as to other industries that the ownership of a great many of them is largely in the hands of those who do not live in the State?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is not true with regard to any other stock or agricultural industry.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps not in agriculture, strictly speaking; but what about cattle?

Mr. PITTMAN. The cattle are owned by two thousand five hundred and some-odd farmers, while the sheep are owned by 314 individuals.

Mr. WARREN. But there are quite a good many nonresident cattle owners, are there not?

Mr. PITTMAN. Very few, I am glad to say, in the State of Nevada.

Mr. WARREN. Speaking of the farmers, I will ask the Senator whether it is not true in his State, as it is in other States, that they find a market for a great deal of their alfalfa, grain, and so forth, with the sheep men, who keep sheep, but do not engage in raising agricultural crops?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will state that that is correct; that at the present time they are compelled to sell some of their alfalfa to the sheep men; but I want also to say that a few years ago, before their cattle and horses were run off the range, they fed their own alfalfa to their own cattle and their own horses. That is the condition that has been brought about.

The letter from the sheriff says:

I have every reason to believe that in many instances, especially in cases of large flocks, the number returned is understated. For example, I have an instance in mind where the report of the scab inspector shows many more sheep dipped than were returned to me.

Were it not for this fraud by the owners of big bands of sheep, the fact that a still larger percentage of the sheep are owned by these few sheep raisers would be disclosed.

I will not impose upon the Senate by reading this statement, but will gladly submit it to any Senator who may care to check up the computations.

It is hardly possible that even the sheep herder will receive any less by reason of the decreased profits of the sheep owners, as it is impossible to conceive that even a man of his type would work for less wages than he now receives. But admitting for the sake of argument that these five or six hundred Basque sheep herders would receive some indirect benefit from the increased profits of the sheep owners by reason of the duty, I still maintain there is neither reason nor excuse for granting a bonus to these laborers who are imported from the Pyrenees Mountains, between Spain and France, admitting allegiance to neither one nor the other of those great countries—men who do not know what a home is, and do not recognize the authority of government; men of the lowest type and the most inferior intelligence, who rarely seek to become citizens of the country to which they are imported—when such bonus must be taken from the hard earnings of the American farmers who are building homes and rearing their families and adding to the permanent strength of our Nation, and of the business men and professional men who are fighting the battle of life for the advancement of civilization without governmental aid, and of the high-class laboring men who are a part of our national life, who are the defenders of the flag of our country, and who are upbuilding the social and political standing of the masses.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest and a great deal of pleasure to the Senator from Nevada, especially that part of his address referring to the prosperity and probable future development of that great State. I have known more or less of the State for a great many years,

and I have been one of those who have always believed that much of the soil of Nevada was unsurpassed if submitted to a proper system of reclamation. I have been one of those who for many, many long years have struggled, officially and unofficially, to bring about that which is now being developed in the reclamation of the lands.

I agree with the Senator that intensive agriculture is preferable to sheep growing, or cattle growing, or horse growing, or anything of that kind, although I am a firm believer in diversified employments and diversified industries. I do not believe we should blot out any industry because it may have had a few years of drawbacks and may have decreased in importance.

I wish to say that, so far as the State of Nevada is concerned, while congratulating the Senator upon its great prosperity, I certainly am very sorry to hear that he considers all the sheepmen under indictment, and that the sheepmen of Nevada are the lowest of any workmen on earth. That is not true, I may say, of other States. So far as the State of Wyoming is concerned, the men who work on the sheep ranches will compare in intelligence and education with other workers. In fact, we have a great many college graduates who have herded sheep. It is a healthful avocation, and a great many indulge in it. I must say also that I regret a little that all the Senator's figures, and largely his conclusions, are those of the Tariff Board, which he himself discredits.

I desire to give notice that on to-morrow, if agreeable to those in charge of the pending bill, I shall address the Senate on the subject of sheep and woolgrowing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The notice will be recorded.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, in the first place I wish to state that I used the word "indictment" as meaning one with regard to whom something was being investigated. I did not mean to imply that the sheepmen were criminals. I simply used the word in the sense I have stated.

As to the character of the labor I must maintain what I have said before with regard to it.

Mr. WARREN. In the mining of coal in my State it is true that we have to depend very largely upon foreign labor. Quite a proportion of that is uneducated labor and that which we might consider of the lowest "lower" class. Is not that true of most of the industries of the Senator's State?

TRIBUTE TO LABOR.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, as I was going on to say, I must contend, because I have proof of it, that in the State of Nevada practically all of our sheep herders and nearly all of the laborers engaged in the sheep industry are Basque herders, imported from the Pyrenees Mountains especially for that purpose, who speak very little of the English language and rarely ever declare their intention to become citizens of the United States. I do not say that for the purpose of attacking those people; I have nothing on earth against them. But it becomes necessary to refer to the fact in a comparison of those who are benefited and those who are injured by certain industries.

As to the employment of foreigners in other branches of labor in my State, I wish to say that the other foreigners who are engaged in labor in the State are engaged principally in mining; not coal mining, for we have none, but hard-rock mining. There are no higher class laborers than miners. All of them are union miners. All of them stand for union wages. They are all capable, intelligent workers, and every one of them declares his intention to become a citizen of the United States just the minute the opportunity is offered to him. There is no comparison whatever between the ordinary foreigner and the Basque sheep herder from the Pyrenees Mountains.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have listened to a very important and a very illuminating discussion of the subject of free wool. I have noticed during the entire discussion the absence from the benches on the Republican side of nearly all of the Republican Senators. With the exception of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who are practically always in their seats, and a few other notable exceptions, the speaker has addressed empty benches on that side. I wish to call attention particularly to the fact that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who the other day directed the attention of the country from this floor to a similar situation when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] addressed the Senate upon an equally important subject, has not been present at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Colorado was not in the Chamber yesterday when I called attention to the fact that during an important debate there were just two Senators on that side of the Chamber present.

Mr. THOMAS. I was not.

Mr. GALLINGER. For about one hour and a half we had the privilege of looking into the eyes of only two distinguished Senators on that side of the Chamber. It grieved me very much and I called attention to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I regret anything that occurred here that would in any manner grieve the genial and lovable Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I said what I did just now, not in any complaining mood but merely to call attention to the fact that a similar criticism uttered upon the floor of the Senate a few days ago, and I think a just one, was a criticism which, at times, is equally applicable to both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is right on that point.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has undertaken to prove by the Tariff Board report that it costs nothing, comparatively speaking, to produce wool in this country. He cites particularly the cost of wool in the State of Washington. I simply wish to call the Senator's attention to the report made by the Tariff Board as to what it does cost to produce wool in this country, and not in any one little particular spot that has a few sheep of one particular kind that are raised principally for mutton.

On page 11 of the Tariff Board report I find the following:

That in the western part of the United States, where about two-thirds of the sheep of the country are to be found, the "fine" and "fine medium" wools carry an average charge of at least 11 cents per pound, interest not included.

That if account is taken of the entire wool production of the country, including both fine and coarse wools, the average charge against the clip is about 9½ cents per pound.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, while the Tariff Board raises the average cost of producing wool in this country by including the cost of certain producers who are not pursuing a practical method, the Senator does not attack what I said with regard to the cost of producing wool in the State of Washington, and that is what he said he got up for.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not quite understand the Senator. I did not say that I got up to attack anybody.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understood the Senator to state that he was getting up to attack my quotations in regard to the State of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President; I did not say I was getting up to attack anybody. I simply said I desired to call attention to what the Tariff Board really did say as to what it costs to produce wool in this country, and cited the fact that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] had been quoting from the same report and had taken one State to show that the cost of wool in that one particular State was little or nothing. That is all I said.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I acknowledge that the average cost is greatly increased over the State of Washington or the State of Nevada by what I was trying to explain were unnecessary costs in some of these States. I was trying to explain to the Senator and to the Senate that in the State of Washington and in the State of Nevada, where the conditions are practically similar to those in Montana and Wyoming, they could raise wool at a very small cost, and that there was no reason why the other States should not be able to do the same thing. I can conceive that the average cost of raising fruit in this country might be made to appear so great in comparison with other countries that fruit could not be raised here, if we tried to raise pineapples and tropical fruits in hothouses in this country. If you should take that cost and throw it into the cost of raising apples, you would find the average cost of raising all agricultural products in this country so great that we could not compete with anybody in anything; and that is exactly the condition with regard to the wool industry to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no part of this country that undertakes to grow wool where the conditions are not at least favorable for it. Wool can be grown in New Mexico or in Utah or in Wyoming or in Montana just as well as it can in Nevada. I believe the Tariff Board is right when it says:

That in the western part of the United States—

That does not mean one State—

Mr. PITTMAN. It includes that State, though.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it includes that State—

where about two-thirds of the sheep of the country are to be found, the "fine" and "fine medium" wools carry an average charge of at least 11 cents per pound, interest not included.

If the Senator knows anything about the wool business, he knows that the fine and fine medium wools are the wools that are grown in the Western States and they are the wools that are called for by the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, they seem to be called for with a very unprofitable demand, by the Senator's own state-

ment. If he is right, why do not the people out there raise the sort of sheep from which both the mutton and the wool can be sold at a profit, instead of trying to raise some for which there is an immense demand and yet no profitable demand?

Mr. SMOOT. So far as concerns the few sheep that are raised upon the farm, to which no expense whatever is charged—I mean none is charged against their keep, since they are fed by the help around the barn—the cost is not to be compared with a great herd of sheep that run upon the public domain, where so much a head is charged for the feeding of the sheep during the season on forest reserves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there is one thing which has been clearly demonstrated by the members of the Republican Party in the last 20 years it is that the American white man can not compete with anybody in doing anything, and needs protection for everything. In view of the admission, for the sake of the argument, of this grand principle, I suggest that we go on with the matter of flax straw, which I believe is pending, and complete it.

Mr. WALSH. Before we go on to that, Mr. President, I desire to say that if, in my judgment, it were possible to attribute to any language used by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, in the address he has just delivered, the significance attached to it by the Senator from Wyoming in what he said was the characterization made by the Senator from Nevada of those engaged in the wool industry, I should feel it an imperative duty to join him in that protest. I stand here to attest, because I have been brought into intimate contact with them, the very high character of the men engaged in the wool business and the sheep industry in my State. But I can not conceive how anybody could so distort the language used by the Senator from Nevada or give to it any such significance as that attributed to it by the Senator from Wyoming.

We all understood perfectly well that the Senator from Nevada was characterizing, in the way he thought they deserved, the particular class of people who engage in the occupation of sheep herders in the State of Nevada. He said nothing whatever concerning the character of those who were engaged in the sheep industry in that State.

Likewise, I should feel it my duty to make some protest if, indeed, the Senator from Nevada had said that the sheepmen were under indictment. It is perfectly obvious that he did not say anything of the sort. It seemed to me entirely proper for the Senator from Nevada to invite attention to the fact that the report of the Tariff Board and the statistics gathered by it are to be considered and weighed in connection with the obvious and indisputable fact that the information they got came from those who naturally are desirous of sustaining the duties.

Mr. SMOOT. Where else could they get it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WALSH. It is a matter of no consequence as to where they could get it or where they could not get it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will suspend. Recognition must be obtained from the Chair before they proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WALSH. I yield readily to the Senator from Utah, and I will answer his question.

Mr. SMOOT. I asked the question, Where else could the information be obtained if not from the men who paid the bills and who knew exactly what the cost was?

Mr. WALSH. I am very glad to answer the Senator from Utah that it could not be obtained anywhere else, but that does not lessen to any degree whatever the fact that those things must be taken into consideration in arriving at the weight that is to be given to the information thus furnished.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I take issue with the statement that the information could not be obtained anywhere else. I think the information could be obtained somewhere else. I think it could be obtained from various sources besides the man who raises the sheep. I think you could obtain that information from the employee much better than you could from the employer. I think you could obtain it from the assessors of the various counties, who watch those things and investigate those matters. You could obtain that information from the bankers in the various communities. I think it is a mistake to say that the only way you can get evidence of facts is to ask the man against whom you are trying to get the evidence.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that, of course, you can find out what a herder is paid by asking him, but a herder does not know anything about what it costs to board him; a herder does not know

anything about what it costs to run a sheep wagon; a herder does not know anything about what the losses may be. The banker does not know anything about what the sheepmen may get for their wool. The banker does not know what expenses the sheepmen must pay. He knows what interest they pay.

I think the Senator from Montana was well within the truth in the statement he made. You can not know what the wool costs unless you get the information from the man who pays all the bills and knows exactly what he receives and what he pays out.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Republican Tariff Board seemed to go on that theory, because, apparently, they did not ask anyone except the man that was to be benefited by a duty on wool.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it having been clearly demonstrated not only that the American white man can not compete with anybody in doing anything, but that the most credible witness to be found is an interested witness, I hope we may now go on with the flax, hemp, and jute schedule.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Democratic Party succeeds in getting free hemp for its use some four years hence I should like in the meantime to protect the farmers of my State. I should like to keep the little tow mills running throughout the State. One farmer may make \$50, another may make \$100 or \$150 a year on the little amount of flax he may haul to the mills. Therefore if the mills are closed he will necessarily lose that little sum. It means considerable to him; and before it is voted away by the other side, I think at least we ought to have the entire vote of the Senate. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Hughes	Overman	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	James	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Jones	Page	Smoot
Bryan	Kenyon	Perkins	Sterling
Burton	Kern	Pittman	Stone
Catron	La Follette	Pomerene	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Chilton	Lea	Robinson	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Shafroth	Tillman
Colt	McCumber	Sheppard	Townsend
Fall	McLean	Sherman	Walsh
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shields	Warren
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Weeks
Gore	Myers	Simmons	Williams

Mr. JAMES. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from attendance here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. THORNTON] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 272, page 83, line 12, after "dressed," strike out "one-half of," so as to read:

272. Flax, not hackled or dressed, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. McCUMBER. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], and I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], and vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He has a general pair with

the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire to have this announcement stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. RANDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. THORNTON] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is necessarily absent, and that he is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. THOMAS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Root], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], and vote "nay."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). When I voted a moment ago it escaped my recollection that I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] during his enforced absence from the city. I therefore withdraw my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff].

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] requested me to announce that he is unavoidably absent and that he is paired, as just stated by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BRISTOW. I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is necessarily absent and that he is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Brady	Fall	McCumber	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gallinger	McLean	Sterling
Bristow	Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Norris	Townsend
Catron	Kenyon	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Perkins	
Crawford	Lodge	Sherman	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	James	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Kern	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lane	Robinson	Stone
Chamberlain	Lea	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chilton	Lewis	Shafroth	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thompson
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Walsh
Gore	Myers	Shively	Williams
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	

NOT VOTING—27.

Bankhead	Dillingham	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Borah	du Pont	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Goff	Owen	Thornton
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Tillman
Clapp	Jackson	Reed	Vardaman
Culberson	Johnson	Root	Works
Cummins	Newlands	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. McCUMBER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee to strike out paragraph 272.

Mr. McCUMBER. The effect of this amendment being to place that item upon the free list, I think there should be a yeas-and-nays vote. I ask for a yeas-and-nays vote upon that one proposition.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] and withhold my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when Mr. POINDEXTER's name was called). I again announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] and his pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] during his absence from the city, and therefore I withhold my vote. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] and withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Root] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote "yea."

Mr. RANDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. THORNTON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. Root]. If my colleague were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I again transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRISTOW. I again make the announcement as to the absence of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I wish this announcement to stand for other roll calls to-day.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Ashurst	James	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Lane	Robinson	Stone
Bryan	Lea	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lewis	Shafroth	Thomas
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Walsh
Fletcher	Myers	Shively	Williams
Gore	Overman	Simmons	
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	
Hughes	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—30.

Brady	Fall	McCumber	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gallinger	McLean	Sterling
Bristow	Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Norris	Townsend
Catron	Kenyon	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Perkins	
Crawford	Lodge	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bankhead	Dillingham	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Borah	du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Goff	Oliver	Stephenson
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Owen	Thornton
Clapp	Jackson	Poindexter	Tillman
Culberson	Johnson	Reed	Vardaman
Cummins	Kern	Root	Works

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was to strike out paragraph 273, in the following words:

273. Flax, baled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. McCUMBER. I propose to amend the paragraph so that it will read as follows:

273. Flax, baled, known as "dressed line," 3 cents per pound.

I only desire to say, not asking for a roll call on this amendment, that it is the old rate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was to strike out paragraph 274, in the following words:

274. Tow of flax, \$10 per ton.

Mr. McCUMBER. On this amendment I should like to have some information from the chairman of the committee or the Senator in charge. I have prepared an amendment which I will read, and I ask the Senator's attention to it. It is to make the paragraph read as follows:

274. Tow of flax, used generally for upholstering and insulating, for refrigerators and refrigerator cars, paper and twine, and not used generally for weaving, \$20 per ton.

Mr. President, this is the particular paragraph that interests us more especially in my State, and the three Northwestern States producing flax and flax straw, than any other paragraph in this particular schedule. We are not attempting in any way by offering this amendment to interfere with a reduction of tariffs according to your program on any character of fabric, but where the fiber is so short that it can not be used for weaving purposes to advantage, and is used generally for the purpose of packing or insulating, for refrigerator cars, for

making paper and some character of twine—it is not used for binding twine—where no one of the general public would be benefited by it, where it cheapens nothing to the ultimate consumer, where it destroys an industry without any general benefit, we feel that the industry of agriculture in general, which has been attacked all along the line by this bill, might be spared this final blow.

I should like to ask the Senator, if he will be kind enough to give me the information, what is to be gained by putting flax fiber on the free list, so far as it relates to this short-fibered tow, which can only be used for the purposes which I have mentioned?

It may be that in the draft of the amendment which I have made it will not exactly fit what I expect to accomplish, but if it does not it can be easily corrected either on the floor or in conference. I am seeking by this amendment to keep open the little tow mills in my State, and I am seeking it with the belief that no one will be injured by keeping them open and that the farmers of my State will be benefited thereby.

I will be glad to have the Senator in charge of the schedule give any reason why we should not be protected on this particular character of flax fiber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, unless my memory fails me, and it is becoming somewhat confused, the Senator from North Dakota asked this question yesterday and made exactly these remarks, and I made a stagger at a reply to the best of my ability, and I thought we might have left it there.

But tow of flax is a by-product of hackling, and it is used in the manufacture of the cheaper grades of yarn known as tow yarn. What sort of cloth tow yarns enter into I do not know, but they enter into something.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am excluding all kind of yarns and including only that tow which can not be used for spinning or weaving and will not be so used.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I want to say to the Senator he is not doing anything he thinks he is doing.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well, if I have not in the language used reached my desires, I hope the Senator will assist me in correcting it so that it will accomplish what I wish to accomplish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I really confess that I decline the offer to assist because I do not know precisely what the Senator wants. But tow of flax, as I said, is a by-product of hackling, and it is used in the manufacture of the cheaper grades of yarn known as tow yarns in the trade.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that once before this stuff was put upon the free list, and that was in the Wilson law. Under the Wilson law, with it on the free list, only 1,711½ tons were imported into the entire United States.

Now, I want to call the Senator's attention to the price per ton of the sort of tow that was imported. My object in doing that is to let him know that the sort of tow he is trying to protect is not the sort of tow that is imported at all. The sort of short-fibered tow to which the Senator is referring, which enters, as the Senator says, only into cushions and upholstery and refrigerating cars and all that sort of thing, was not imported into the United States at all, even when tow of flax was upon the free list; but the tow of flax which was imported into the United States was a tow of flax out of which these yarns are made, the unit value of which, if I can get the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, because it is useless to attempt to answer his question unless he listens to the reply—

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to assure the Senator that I am listening intensely, and I am gathering every word that he says.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the contrary, I saw you gathering a great deal of some other sort of misinformation from the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. McCUMBER. My ear was turned toward the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, the average unit of that sort of tow that was imported when it was upon the free list was \$152.50 per ton, and the sort of tow that you are talking about is worth \$18 to 20 per ton, by your own statement, showing that it was a different thing. In 1905 the average price of it was \$183 per ton, and under the Payne tariff law, in 1911, the average price per ton of this stuff that was imported, tow of flax, was \$157 per ton, and in 1912 it had risen to \$188 per ton.

This stuff that the Senator is talking about, that is not fit to make yarn out of at all, is not going to be imported if you put it on the free list, and if you put a bounty on it you would have difficulty in getting it imported, unless you paid a pretty heavy bounty. The sort of tow that we are trying to get on

the free list is tow that does enter into certain yarns for weaving a certain product, and the sort of tow the Senator is talking about they do not make yarn out of at all.

I do not know anything about your peculiar product except what you have told me, but from what you have told me all you can do with it is to make cushions, for upholstering, and I believe for refrigerator cars, and things of that sort.

I have tried to answer this question once before to the best of my poor ability. I do not know what sort of tow yours is, except that it is worth \$18 to \$20 a ton, and this tow that we are talking about was imported last year at \$190 a ton, and the duty was paid into the Treasury at the rate fixed at that time. There were 1,325 tons of it imported, and the duties collected were \$26,516. The sort of tow which was imported and the sort of tow we are trying to get imported in still larger quantities is the sort of tow out of which certain yarns are made for use in the textile industries of the country, and by the admission of the Senator from North Dakota his tow is not that sort of tow.

Mr. McCUMBER. The great trouble with the answer of the Senator from Mississippi is that he insists on answering a question that I do not ask and he does not answer the question that I do ask. I have not asked him anything about why he should not exclude the fiber that is used for spinning purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor have I said a word about the fiber. I was giving the Senator the figures upon the tow, and I was telling him what the tow was used for, to wit, to make certain yarns. He said his sort of tow is not used to make yarns at all. Therefore I was telling him that the sort of tow that would come in would not be any kind of tow that would compete with his kind of tow.

Mr. McCUMBER. On that the Senator is mistaken. Read the paragraph. It says:

Tow of flax, \$10 per ton.

Now, that includes all kinds of tow of flax. It is not limited at all to the particular kind that is used for weaving, and so forth. It now includes the short-fibered flax that is used for other purposes. It is nevertheless tow of flax.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is put upon the free list by this paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will try once more, and if I fail this time I want to confess my inability to use English. What I attempted to say was that when we put tow of flax—

Mr. McCUMBER. I will reach that part of it—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which, of course, includes all this tow upon the free list, when we come to the actuality of the importation the sort of tow of flax that has been imported and will be imported is not the sort of tow of flax the Senator means.

Mr. McCUMBER. The great trouble with the Senator is that he does not wait until he gets the full answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore your question as to why we want to admit the importation of tow which does not enter into yarns and does not enter into textile fabrics falls to the ground, because our object is to permit the importation of the sort of tow that does make yarn and does enter into textile fabrics.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will be a little patient and allow me to finish my reply he will ascertain that there has been an answer to his suggestion; but I can only reach one part of it at a time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I made no suggestion. I was trying to answer the question of the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. The first proposition is that there are now—I do not care what there was 20 years ago—there are to-day two kinds of flax tow that are being used in the United States. One is used for a certain purpose, that of packing or insulating refrigerator cars, for upholstering, to a small extent in making paper, and probably to a less extent in making wrapping twine. That is one of the kinds of tow that is being used in the United States to-day. The other kind of tow—

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield to the Senator as soon as I have finished.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. The other kind of tow that is being used in the United States is a long-fibered tow, which can be used for spinning into yarn and for weaving into different characters of fabrics. The paragraph of the bill which puts flax tow upon the free list covers both.

The Senator says that when we had the articles named in the same paragraph practically on the free list, we still did not import any of the kind of tow that is used for insulating, and so forth. Will the Senator tell me when we first began to use that kind of tow in the United States? Will the Senator tell me when the first tow mills that began to use, and were put in operation to use, this particular kind of tow were established

in the United States? My conviction is, although I will not speak definitely, that there was not a tow mill of this kind in the United States or in Canada at that time. We used for insulating our refrigerator cars at that time charcoal, sawdust, and other similar substances.

It has been found that we can make the short-fibered flax tow, and we thereby make a better insulator, and it can also be used for other purposes. Therefore, within the last 20 years, I would say within the last 15 years, this kind of a product has come into general use for the purposes which I have mentioned. It was not in general use during the operation of the tariff law of which the Senator from Mississippi has spoken. While it was not imported at that time, because there was no use for it in the United States, to my knowledge, and while it has not since been imported, we are using it; and because we have had a tariff that was practically prohibitory of importations is no reason why it will not be imported when we place it upon the free list.

As a matter of fact, however, it has been imported, and there has been a case before the Treasury Department for some time in regard to the importation. I do not know whether or not it has been settled, but I know a number of shipments came in from Canada under the name of broken flax straw. They gave it that name to differentiate it from the hackled straw, so that it might come in under a \$5-per-ton duty, rather than the \$20-per-ton duty provided for on hackled straw. The appraisers allowed it to come in at the \$5-per-ton duty. A case was made before the Treasury Department and an appeal taken from the decision. That appeal, I believe, is now pending. So it has been and it can be brought in, and if it has been brought in under a \$5-per-ton duty, certainly it will be brought in in very much larger quantities upon a free-trade basis. That is the reason why I am seeking to protect this new article of use, and by its protection keep open the little mills in the three northwestern States I have mentioned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota says that this article will be imported. I do not know whether it will be or not. That fact is in the womb of the future; I will try to put the matter in a different shape. It either will be imported or it will not be imported; that is a certainty. If it will not be imported, the Senator has been talking about an anticipated injury which will not exist, an injury to a special interest engaged in this particular business, and constituting perhaps not one-tenth of 1 per cent of the people of the United States. If it will be imported, then it will cheapen insulating and refrigerating, and that will be a great benefit to everybody, and also to modern science and modern industry. At any rate, that is our view of it in the alternative, and we are willing to vote upon it and to stand by what we do, rather than merely by what we say.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if it is to be sustained upon the ground that closing up the mill to the farmer will be a benefit to science by reason of its being a benefit to the manufacturer of refrigerating cars and refrigerators, I am willing to go to a vote upon that proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, everything that cheapens insulating, everything that cheapens refrigeration, helps not only science and transportation, but it helps the entire people, all of whom have interest in insulating and in transportation. Of course the Senator from North Dakota knows as well as I do that the railroads do not pay for the tracks, that they do not pay for the coaches, that they do not pay for the steam engines, that they do not pay for anything except in the first instance, but that in the long run the people pay for them. The Senator understands that the companies that are refrigerating and insulating do not pay for refrigerating and insulation except in the first instance, and that in the long run the people pay for it. The cheaper it is the better for the people. So I shall rest satisfied.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have expressed my serious doubt that the manufacturers of those refrigerator cars will sell them cheaper because of the little benefit that they have gained and the little benefit that the farmers now have from their flax. The Senator thinks they will, but I do not think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why does the Senator say "the farmers"? When the Senator says that, he would have somebody believe that he means the farmers of the United States. I dare say that not one-tenth of 1 per cent of the farmers of the United States, even as farmers, are interested in this.

Mr. McCUMBER. I could probably, Mr. President, pick out four-fifths of the several items that are taxed, which it is considered ought to be taxed even by this bill, and find that not one-tenth of 1 per cent of the population is engaged in their production, but a great many of these one-tenths of 1 per cent make the whole, and we have got to consider all of the industries together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Senator from North Dakota offer an amendment?

Mr. McCUMBER. I offered an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know whether the vote was to be taken on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota or on the committee amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I would suggest that the amendment be again read, as some Senators did not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out in paragraph 274 by the Committee on Finance it is proposed to insert:

274. Tow of flax used generally for upholstering and insulating, for refrigerators and refrigerator cars, paper and twine, and not used generally for weaving, \$20 per ton.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). With the same announcement as that I made on the previous ballot I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and so I will withhold my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and will vote. I vote "yea." I will let the announcement of the change of pairs stand for the day.

Mr. JONES (when Mr. POINDEXTER's name was called). I desire again to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER]. He is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I make this announcement and will let it stand for the remainder of the day.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] and withhold my vote. If I had the privilege of voting, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] and withhold my vote. If I had the privilege of voting, I should vote "nay."

Mr. RANSDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THORNTON]. He is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and desire that this announcement shall stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I understand the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has not voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Arkansas is not recorded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Brady	Crawford	Lodge	Smoot
Brandegge	Gallinger	McCumber	Sterling
Bristow	Groona	McLean	Townsend
Burton	Jones	Nelson	Warren
Catron	Kenyon	Page	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Penrose	
Colt	Lippitt	Perkins	

NAYS—37.

Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lea	Robinson	Stone
Chamberlain	Lewis	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thompson
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Gore	Myers	Shields	Williams
Hollis	Norris	Shively	
Hughes	Overman	Simmons	
James	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bankhead	Dillingham	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Borah	du Pont	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Fall	Owen	Sutherland
Burleigh	Goff	Polindexter	Thomas
Clapp	Hitchcock	Reed	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Root	Tillman
Culberson	Johnson	Sherman	Vardaman
Cummins	Newlands	Smith, Md.	Works

So Mr. McCUMBER's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Democratic Ways and Means Committee and the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives, who are supposed to be close to nature and to have caught something of the aroma of flax and flax straw, saw fit to put a duty of \$10 per ton on tow. The Democratic majority of the Senate in caucus have placed flax tow upon the free list. I am about to attempt, by means of another amendment, to bridge the chasm between the Democracy of the House and the Democracy of the Senate by providing for a duty of \$10 per ton on tow of flax, applying only to that character of flax which can not be used for weaving. I therefore offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee striking out paragraph 274, page 83, line 15, it is proposed to insert:

274. Tow of flax used generally for upholstering and insulating for refrigerators and refrigerator cars, paper, and twine, and not used generally for weaving, \$10 per ton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators seconding the demand will indicate it by raising their hands. [After counting.] In the opinion of the Chair, the demand is not seconded.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Chair to put the request again, so that the Senate will understand the question, for I do not think Senators are paying careful attention at all times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota demands the yeas and nays on his amendment. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Again transferring my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], I vote "yea."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). On account of my general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] I withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and for that reason withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote "nay."

Mr. RANDELL (when Mr. THORNTON's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THORNTON] and ask that this announcement stand for the day. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. Repeating my announcement on the last ballot as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I withhold my vote on account of my pair with that Senator.

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Brady	Crawford	Lodge	Sherman
Brandagee	Gallinger	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Gronna	McLean	Sterling
Burton	Jones	Nelson	Townsend
Carson	Kenyon	Norris	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Penrose	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Perkins	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Lea	Reed	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Lewis	Robinson	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Stone
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Swanson
Fletcher	Myers	Sheppard	Thomas
Hollis	Overman	Shields	Thompson
Hughes	Pittman	Shively	Walsh
James	Pomerene	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—32.

Bankhead	Dillingham	Kern	Smith, Md.
Borah	du Pont	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Fall	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Burleigh	Goff	Oliver	Sutherland
Clapp	Gore	Owen	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Pace	Tillman
Culberson	Jackson	Polindexter	Vardaman
Cummins	Johnson	Root	Works

So Mr. McCUMBER's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. McCUMBER. The next vote will be on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the committee. The amendment would place this product upon the free list. It is very important to my State, and I will ask the indulgence of the Senate to have a record vote, assuring the Senate that I will not ask for the yeas and nays on any remaining items of this schedule. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee, on which the Senator from North Dakota demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply want to say a word before the vote is taken. I find on inquiry that the product about which the Senator from North Dakota has been speaking has been construed by the board of appraisers, and they have held that it is not hackled flax, but that it is flax straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to correct the statement—

Mr. SIMMONS. I mean the character of the material which the Senator has been discussing as used in refrigerator cars and for stuffing furniture, horse collars, and the like. It has been decided by the board of appraisers that that material is simply run through a machine containing corrugated rolls which have the effect of breaking up the straw and rendering it pliable, so as to fit it for use in stuffing furniture, and so on. They have held that that is not hackled flax or tow of flax, but that it is flax straw, and dutiable under the present law at \$5 per ton.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I feel it incumbent upon me to correct the error of the Senator in two respects.

The material I have been discussing heretofore that came under paragraph 273 as hackled flax is that which comes from the mills in my State and in Minnesota. The Senator has referred to the decision in a case that I referred to a short time ago, where some broken straw was brought over from Canada. In other words, it involved a sort of halfway process between the breaking with the separator and the breaking and the separation in the tow mill, because the tow mill does more than the mere breaking. It simply severs to a considerable extent a portion of the pulp, and that is finished by knives on the machines in the East that take it up. So what the Senator refers to is not that which is covered by the preceding paragraph, and this vote is not upon that at all, but it is upon the tow itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on previous ballots and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer of pairs as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). Because of my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I withhold my vote, being paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I repeat the announcement made on the last vote, make the same transfer, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am informed that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has not voted. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I wish to withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.
Bacon	Lea	Robinson	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lewis	Saulsbury	Stone
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Myers	Shields	Thompson
Hollis	Overman	Shively	Vardaman
Hughes	Pittman	Simmons	Walsh
James	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—27.

Brady	Crawford	Lodge	Sherman
Brandeggee	Gallinger	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Gronna	McLean	Sterling
Burton	Jones	Nelson	Sutherland
Catron	Kenyon	Norris	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Page	Warren
Colt	Lippitt	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—33.

Bankhead	du Pont	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Borah	Fall	Oliver	Thornton
Bradley	Goff	Owen	Tillman
Burleigh	Gore	Penrose	Weeks
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Polindexter	Williams
Clapp	Jackson	Reed	Works
Culberson	Johnson	Root	
Cummins	Kern	Smith, Md.	
Dillingham	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 83, to strike out all of paragraph 275, in the following words:

275. Hemp, and tow of hemp, one-half cent per pound; hemp, hackled, known as "line of hemp," 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 276, page 83, lines 18, 19, and 20, to strike out "not finer than 5 lea or number, 15 per cent ad valorem; if finer than 5 lea or number and yarns made of jute."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to get some information from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on this paragraph. Is there not a considerable quantity of jute used in the manufacture of binding twine?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I really do not know.

Mr. GRONNA. I thought perhaps the Senator had that information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have not.

Mr. GRONNA. I see from the handbook that during the year 1912 there were imported 1,256,000 pounds of single yarns made of jute not finer than No. 5 lea or number, and that 114,000 pounds of finer quality were imported. I take it that the Committee on Finance does not intend to tax the binding twine that the farmer uses to bind his grain and place all the articles which he produces on the free list. I know full well that paragraph 423—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Binding twine is on the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; paragraph 423 provides as follows:

423. All binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 600 feet to the pound.

I will say to the Senators on the other side that that does not include all binding twine.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SHIVELY. We were informed in the course of the consideration of the bill that there is absolutely none of this article used in the manufacture of binding twine. It is not used for that purpose at all.

Mr. GRONNA. I was asking for information, for I know that in my State a considerable quantity of what was known as jute twine was used some years ago. It was labeled as jute binding twine. May I ask the Senator who has this schedule in charge for what purpose this article is used? I observe that a large quantity is being imported, and I should like to know for what purpose it is being imported and for what manufacture it is being used.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator wish to know for what purpose these single yarns of jute are imported?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One class of them, the coarser class, is being imported for the purpose of making heavy jute fabrics, and the other class for the purpose of making finer jute fabrics and cloth. Single jute yarns enter into burlap, among other things, when they are a very coarse number.

Mr. GRONNA. I was under the impression that this article was being used in the manufacture of binding twine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it seems not. I had forgotten what the Senator from Indiana mentioned. Probably I was not present at the time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I think I can advise the Senator that jute yarn is the raw material of burlaps.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not only of burlaps, but—

Mr. WALSH. Of all kinds of jute fabrics; and I desire to say to the Senator from North Dakota that he will find binding twines generally on the free list under the provisions of paragraph 423.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I have just read the paragraph; but I wish to say to the Senator from Montana—

Mr. WALSH. I have not finished.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I am quite familiar with binding twine, and that paragraph 423 does not include all kinds of binding twine.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to say to the Senator from North Dakota, and to the other Senators also, that the language of paragraph 423, as far as that goes, is the same as the language of paragraph 507 of the present act, which reads:

Binding twine: All binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, etc.

The language is the same. So that paragraph 423 does not include all kinds of binding twine. It was because the committee apparently was led into an error by the provisions of the existing law.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the Senator from Montana why the farmer should pay a duty on binding twine that runs more than 600 feet to the pound?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know. I supposed that measured the binding twine.

Mr. GRONNA. It does not. The Senator from Montana will find that there is binding twine running 700 feet to the pound; that is, if manufactured of pure manila.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the Senator's remark? I did not catch it.

Mr. GRONNA. My statement was that you will find binding twine that will run more than 700 feet to the pound, if the twine is manufactured from pure manila.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. GRONNA. It has this much to do with it, that the paragraph places a limitation upon it. It provides that twine which measures not more than 600 feet to the pound shall be placed on the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the Senator means the free list?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When we get to that we will deal with it.

Mr. GRONNA. I was trying to deal with both at one time. When the farmer buys his twine he has to deal with both the purchase price and the question of paying for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator pleases, paragraph 276 relates to single yarns made of jute not otherwise specially provided for in this section. That has nothing at all to do with binding twine. Binding twine is in paragraph 423, upon the free list. When we reach that, if the Senator can show us any mistake we have made about it we shall take pleasure in either recommitting it for consideration or correcting it here. But that paragraph is not now under consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I realize that; but my attention was called to paragraph 423 by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That does not deal with jute at all. Paragraph 423 has nothing to do with jute.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that it may be jute, or it may be something else.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to my colleague first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that the Chair shall have a little something to say about this matter. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to his colleague from North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, Mr. President; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McCUMBER. I simply desire to say to my colleague that some years ago jute was mixed with sisal in making binding twine. Just as to what extent that has continued, I have no information. I am also informed that some years ago binding twine was made entirely of jute; that is, some kinds were made of jute. Whether that has been continued up to the present time or not, I am not prepared to say. But I wish to say to my colleague that this bill would be out of Democratic harmony if, after placing the farmer's product upon the free list, it did not tax the same product when he has to buy it back in twine or in some other form.

Mr. GRONNA. I now yield to the Senator from Montana if he desires.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that paragraph 423 contains exactly the same limitation that the present law does in relation to length. I am entirely satisfied that it was the purpose of the Finance Committee to put binding twine, without reservation, upon the free list. Apparently, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was framed there was no information before the Senate that jute was employed in the manufacture of binding twine at all; neither was it suggested, apparently, that the limitation "not exceeding 600 feet to the pound" was not an entirely proper limitation. If the Senator has any information to the effect that that will not include all kinds of binding twine I trust he will present it, because I shall be glad to join him in asking the Finance Committee to make the appropriate change.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Montana and to the Senate that I have on many occasions measured binding twine and weighed it, and I know of my own knowledge that there is binding twine that runs more than 600 feet to the pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to state to the Senator from North Dakota that the Senator from Montana is entirely right in stating that the Finance Committee intended to place all kinds of binding twine upon the free list; and if any information is brought to our attention to show that it is manufactured out of jute, or, as the Senator from North Dakota says, that it sometimes runs more than 600 feet to the pound, we shall be glad to make the change so as to carry out the purpose we had in view.

Mr. GRONNA. I was quite sure of that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will let us go on now with the paragraph we have under consideration; and when we reach the paragraph in the free list dealing with binding twine we shall be glad to take up the matter with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If binding twine was ever made partially or altogether of jute, the reason why it is not now made of it is palpable, because under the Payne-Aldrich bill all binding twine was placed upon the free list; that is, binding twine made out of New Zealand hemp, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them. As a consequence, of course, people would have been stupid to import jute for binding twine or jute yarn when they could get better binding twine free of duty. As far as that is concerned, binding twine might be made out of cotton. If you are going to put upon the free list everything that could possibly be turned into binding twine you will have to put certain grades of cotton upon the free list, as well as jute. Binding

twine might be made out of flax. You would have to put flax yarns upon the free list. It might possibly be made out of hemp. But the framers of the Payne-Aldrich bill met the difficulty in the language I have stated, so that the farmer could get free binding twine without disrupting the cotton and jute and flax schedules; and he gets it. The only thing we did was to leave out the proviso which the Payne-Aldrich bill carried.

If it shall turn out that binding twine does measure more than 600 feet to the pound—and if the Senator says he knows it of his own knowledge, of course it is a fact—then when we get to that paragraph we might very easily strike out the language "not exceeding 600 feet to the pound." But we could not agree to put single jute yarns upon the free list just because they might possibly be used for binding twine any more than we could put certain cotton yarns or flax yarns upon the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator calls attention to the fact that the Payne-Aldrich bill placed a certain duty on jute, but he forgets that it also placed a duty upon what is called by that side of the Chamber raw material. It is true, as the Senator from Mississippi has said, that twine may be and is manufactured out of flax, and I believe it is being manufactured out of jute. I believe a certain quantity of jute is being used in the manufacture of twine. I can see no reason why the farmer should pay a duty on his twine because there is a little jute in it, when nearly all of his products have been placed upon the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But he will not import binding twine and will not buy binding twine with jute in it if he can get binding twine equally good or better without jute in it and at a lower price.

Mr. GRONNA. I have seen the time when the farmer was compelled to buy the kind of binding twine that was being offered him, and that condition confronts the farmer almost every year. The twine, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, is being controlled by trusts, by cordage companies, by the International Harvester Trust. Why do you wish to place a duty on the farmer's binding twine when you are placing his products on the free list? I ask the Senator from Mississippi that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My answer is very plain. We are not placing a duty upon the farmer's binding twine at all. On the contrary, we are continuing it upon the free list, where we found it.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; that is true. The paragraph in the pending bill is, I understand, the same as the one in the present law.

Mr. SIMMONS. But, Mr. President, the Senator fails to recognize the fact that the paragraph we are dealing with now—276—simply provides for "single yarns made of jute, not otherwise specially provided for in this section." That is all we are dealing with now. The Senator from Mississippi very properly says that we can not amend this paragraph as to put jute yarns on the free list simply because possibly some jute may be used in making binding twine. It is a different article altogether that we are dealing with in this paragraph. It is single jute yarns, not used for binding twine, not made for that purpose at all.

I trust the Senator will let us act on this particular paragraph now and withhold his contention about the free-list paragraph until we reach it.

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand the chairman of the Finance Committee, it is not the intention of the committee to put binding twine on the dutiable list?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the committee has had no such intention; but putting a duty upon single jute yarns will not put any duty on binding twine. That is the question we are dealing with now.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well. Suppose, then, in this paragraph we add the words "not used for binding twine."

Mr. SIMMONS. It says "not otherwise specially provided for"; and if, when we come to the free list referring to this particular item, we should make some change, it would be "otherwise specially provided for."

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina if it is provided for anywhere in this section.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not able right now to point out the paragraph referring to it.

Mr. GRONNA. Paragraph 423.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that is so, paragraph 423 does provide for it.

Mr. GRONNA. Paragraph 423 does not mention jute, however.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand the question to be whether jute binding twine is anywhere upon the free list? Is that the question?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it is not.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from North Dakota has not asked that question, but of course that is a direct answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was that the Senator's question, as I have stated it?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then that is the answer.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I do not think jute is now used in binding twine. At an early day they did use a little Kentucky hemp and some jute. We have done so in Minnesota. We started in 1890, and the manufactory of binding twine was our State prison. It has proved a great success. We began in the first instance to manufacture it from hemp—plain Kentucky hemp. The twine proved a failure. It was clumsy and knotty and would not work well on the machine, and in a year or two it was abandoned. Our State had to throw away the machinery and get a new plant and a new outfit. To-day and for many years past, since we have had the new outfit, our binding twine is made at the State prison from the materials described in the paragraph on the free list.

The very best twine is made, of course, from pure manila. It costs high. Then there is another grade that is made partly from manila and partly from sisal grass or Central American tampico grass. Then there is some cheaper kind made from inferior grasses; but I do not think that now any kind is manufactured from jute. Perhaps in some cases there may be a little.

Our twine plant in the State of Minnesota has proved a wonderful success. I think we are manufacturing now at the rate of 30,000,000 pounds a year. It is furnished to the farmers in carload lots at a little over cost. It is furnished to the dealers at a little less than that, but with the proviso that the dealers must not exact more than 1 cent a pound profit. Our State prison twine has been the great regulator of prices in Minnesota and has held down and checked the price of the Harvester Trust. In fact we control the price of binding twine in the State of Minnesota by the State prison twine, as we call it. All our farmers are hungry for it and take all they can get. Sometimes they can not get enough and they have to buy some from outside dealers.

I am not aware that they use any jute or have used it for years in the manufacture of that twine. I do not think the farmers will use it. I think, speaking from the standpoint of a farmer, it would be a good plan to prevent them from using jute in binding twine, because that would give them a very inferior, worthless quality.

I have made these remarks to bring to the attention of Senators who come from agricultural States what a reform they can effect if they will follow in the wake of the State of Minnesota and set their State prisons to work manufacturing binding twine, and in that way become entirely independent of the trust and furnish the farmers cheap binding twine.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, I simply want to add to what the Senator from Minnesota has said that North Dakota is also manufacturing twine at its State prison and that it has been a success and a factor in regulating prices to the farmers.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Utah allow me to add one word that I omitted to say when on my feet before?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator from North Dakota is right.

The best binder twine made from manila hemp runs more than 600 feet to the pound. It runs as high as 700 feet. I think when you come to that article in the free list if you intend to give the farmers free binding twine you should eliminate that limitation of 600 feet to a pound. You should either eliminate it or make it, say, 800 feet to a pound. I think that is your purpose, and when you come to that I trust you will make that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the inconsistency of this schedule. I will begin with the item in paragraph 276 and follow the yarn of that paragraph to the finished goods. Paragraph 276 provides that "single yarns made of jute, not otherwise specially provided for in this section," shall pay a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem. That is irrespective of the size or number of the yarn.

The next step of manufacture and the next process that single jute yarns are used for we will find in paragraph 288. That paragraph provides that "plain woven fabrics of single

jute yarns, by whatever name known, bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or rendered noninflammable by any process," shall have a rate of 20 per cent ad valorem. That is just the same as the single yarn, irrespective of size. The ad valorem duty is exactly the same, and in order that it carry a duty of 20 per cent it must be bleached, dyed, colored, and so forth.

Now turn to the free list, paragraph 416, and we find on the free list:

Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns by whatever name known, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, printed, or rendered noninflammable by any process, nor in any manner loaded so as to increase the weight per yard; waste of any of the above articles suitable for the manufacture of paper.

In other words, Mr. President, the single yarn itself carries 20 per cent ad valorem. If made into cloth and is bleached, dyed, painted, or stained it carries but 20 per cent ad valorem. If that same yarn is made into burlap and not bleached, dyed, stained, printed, or painted it goes on the free list, while the yarn that the burlap is made from carries a duty of 20 per cent.

That is the history of this one item.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A history without a map?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can so designate it if he wants to. That is the fact as to the working of it. Does the Senator think it is a proper or a consistent way to make a tariff bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perfectly proper, but not consistent, and now I will explain in a few minutes why it is not consistent, as soon as the Senator finishes.

Mr. SMOOT. I will gladly listen to the Senator now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will give the history of it if the Senator is through with the geography now, and the map of it. Is the Senator through?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is one of the illogicalities of this bill, if I may frame that word. It is one of the inconsistencies of the bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. Did the Senator say one of many inconsistencies?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not. I said one of them, and there are not many.

Now and then men are led, when they have common sense, into doing a proper thing inconsistently rather than to be stubbornly stupid in doing a consistent thing. As this bill came over from the House of Representatives it had cotton bagging made out of jute upon the free list. I for one as a southern cotton planter could not afford to stand here in this presence and give the southern cotton planter the cloth for cotton bagging free of duty while the cloth for sacks for the grain and the bagging for the wool of the western farmer bore a duty.

We concluded that if we were going to put the cloth for the southern farmers' cotton bagging upon the free list we should put the cloth for the western farmers' grain sack and for the western farmers' wool bags upon the free list. We therefore put these plain woven fabrics as described in the free list in paragraph 416 as an amendment to that part of the paragraph which put bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, and so forth, upon the free list. That led us into this situation which we had to meet, not as logicians and as logic choppers but as practical men.

We either had to take the cloth for the cotton bagging off of the free list and deprive the southern farmer of that advantage or we had to put the cloth for the wrapping of the western farmer's product upon the free list. Then the question confronted us, Where are you going to go after you do that? Shall you go back then and take the duty off single jute yarn because both cotton bagging and these bags of burlap are made out of single jute yarn? Then we were confronted with the fact that a lot of mills in this country are making single jute yarn.

Now, we have given them free jute, or, rather, they already had it under the Payne-Aldrich law, and so we concluded it was better to be illogical than perhaps to close those people down.

Then when we came to the next paragraph to which the Senator referred, which is paragraph 288, plain woven fabrics of single jute yarn, not suitable for wrapping grain or for wrapping cotton either, we came to the conclusion that if the jute was free and if the duty on the single yarns made of jute was 20 per cent, that would, even from a protectionist standpoint, be a sufficient duty upon the plain woven fabrics for the man who made them.

The Senator asked whether we thought that was a proper thing to do. That depends. We have listened to nothing here for a week except howlings after howlings about being unfair to the farmer and discrimination against him. Now, when we reach a case where we discriminate for him—and this is a real

discrimination, the so-called discriminations against him are alleged discriminations, because we have reduced in dollars and cents the duties upon manufactured products more than we have upon agricultural products, and the allegation of discrimination is arrived at only by the percentage route, which is a very deceiving one—when we come to where we have discriminated in favor of the farmer we are charged with lack of logic, and we frankly confess it.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no need of being inconsistent in this matter at all. It is cured very easily, indeed. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator just long enough for him to tell me how he would cure it, unless he took the duty off of single yarns made of jute altogether and put them on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. Not necessarily. I will tell the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, tell me now. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Single yarns made of jute run from a coarse yarn down to a fine yarn, as the Senator knows. Now, if the Senator wanted cotton bagging and burlaps upon the free list, and they have been put upon the free list, and have a consistent tariff from the jute yarn to the finished product, he would have provided in this paragraph that all single yarns made of jute up to a certain number—

Mr. WILLIAMS. What number?

Mr. SMOOT. I would not say offhand. I would have to look it up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We did not try to look it up. We found nobody could tell us, offhand or any other way.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator within an hour what number it ought to be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish you would; I would like to have the judgment of an expert. We tried to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. It could have been done very easily. There is no doubt about it. I do not want to say right offhand without having the information that would make it absolutely accurate, just exactly what it is, but the Senator knows that burlap used to make grain bags and cotton bagging that covers cotton contains certain sizes of jute yarn. Both are staple articles, made in many parts of the world and in the same way; weigh wherever made about the same per pound. It would have been very easy, indeed, to make jute yarns used in burlap for grain bags and cotton bagging free, and in so doing make this a consistent bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator says he can tell us how. We tried to find out how. There were men before us who were manufacturing burlaps. There were men before us who were importing burlaps, and I asked several of them about this very matter.

Now, we could do it as to cotton bagging, and the House did make the distinction as to cotton bagging; that is to say, this stuff where there is an excess of 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard. Then I asked if anybody could give me a number of threads or any other line of demarcation that would discriminate and differentiate, dividing bagging suitable for woollacks and for grain bags from the other sort of burlaps. I wish I had known that the Senator from Utah was an expert upon this matter. I would have sent for him and maybe I would have gotten the information, but we did not get it from anybody else.

Moreover, we knew, as men of common sense, that one sort of burlap would hold corn, and that a finer sort of burlap to hold wheat or oats or barley or rye would have a closer texture, be more closely woven, while the burlap that wraps cotton you can stick your fist through, yet it is sufficient for that purpose. We then used this language so as to cover the stuff that they make woollacks and grain bags out of:

Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns by whatever name known, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, printed, or rendered noninflammable by any process, nor in any manner loaded so as to increase the weight per yard; waste of any of the above articles suitable for the manufacture of paper.

Then we left the other burlaps which were bleached or dyed or colored or stained or printed or rendered noninflammable upon the dutiable list. Our idea was to interfere with existing conditions as little as we consistently could, provided we gave the farmers all over the land free wrappings for their products, and provided we made a sensible and reasonable reduction upon the finished products of jute, flax, and hemp. The "illogicality" of it, if I may frame the word, is obvious to a school boy; it took nobody to discover that; we had known it already.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate, because I want to get on with this bill,

but I have simply called the attention of the Senate to this inconsistency. The Senator admits the inconsistency, and—

Mr. WILLIAMS. We can make it logical—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I will then yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We can make it logical by striking out the free listing of these two products, if anybody wants to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. Nobody has suggested anything like that. I would have been through before this, if the Senator had not interrupted me. The Senator admits that both the Senate and the House bills provide for cotton bagging on the free list and names the number of threads per inch and the size of those threads. There was no difficulty about that, and yet the very threads that go into the cotton bagging are dutiable at 20 per cent under this bill. There is no necessity for that. You could have taken those threads out without question, because the free list particularly mentions what threads are meant, and that could have been done with burlap. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator would put single yarns made of jute on the free list?

Mr. SMOOT. Not all of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You would put those threads of which cotton bagging is made upon the free list?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and also cotton bagging.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator know how many factories in the United States manufacture the yarns out of which cotton bagging is made?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I do know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then if they had to quit, you would be telling us that we had started a soup house somewhere and discharged a lot of laborers. What we did was to reduce the duty upon threads and yarns and to put these two particular products upon the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no earthly difference whether a man goes to the soup house because he can not make the yarn or because he can not make the cloth; the result would be exactly the same thing.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that he has not heard any complaint from me about the duty on grain bags. So far as my State is concerned—and I think the same is the case in the adjoining States—we do not use grain bags in any great quantity. We spout the grain from the thrashing machine into grain tanks, and then it is carried to the elevator or granary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are used for wheat, for barley, for oats, for rice, for rice flour, and other grains.

Mr. SMOOT. And for wool.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And for wool.

Mr. WALSH. I merely desire to say in connection with what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has said that the custom is quite different in my State, because there practically all grain is sacked in the field where it is thrashed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 276, page 83, line 21, after the word "section," to strike out "25" and insert "20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in paragraph 278, page 84, line 4, after the word "value," to strike out "25" and insert "20," and in line 5, after the word "number," to strike out "30" and insert "25," so as to make the paragraph read:

278. Threads, twines, or cords, made from yarn not finer than 5 lea or number, composed of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem; if made from yarn finer than 5 lea or number, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 279, page 84, line 9, after the word "number," to strike out "15" and insert "12"; and in line 10, after the word "number," to strike out "25" and insert "20," so as to make the paragraph read:

279. Single yarns, made of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, not finer than 8 lea or number, 12 per cent ad valorem; finer than 8 lea or number and not finer than 80 lea or number, 20 per cent ad valorem; finer than 80 lea or number, 10 per cent ad valorem; ramie sliver or roving, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 280, page 84, line 17, before the words "per cent," to strike out "30" and insert "25," so as to make the paragraph read:

280. Gill netting, nets, webs, and seines made of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, or of which any of them is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 281, page 84, line 23, after the word "matting," to strike out "24" and insert "2," so as to make the paragraph read:

281. Floor mattings, plain, fancy, or figured, including mats and rugs, manufactured from straw, round or split, or other vegetable substances, not otherwise provided for in this section, and having a warp of cotton, hemp, or other vegetable substances, including what are commonly known as China, Japan, and India straw matting, 2 cents per square yard.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 282, page 85, line 2, after the words "(except cotton)," to strike out "35" and insert "30," so as to make the paragraph read:

282. Carpets, carpeting, mats, and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber (except cotton), 80 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 283 was read, as follows:

283. Hydraulic or flume hose, made in whole or in part of cotton, flax, hemp, ramie, or jute, 7 cents per pound.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the duty that is imposed by this paragraph on linen hydraulic or flume hose. The duty in the existing law on the flax yarns from which they are made is 45 per cent and the duty on the completed article of hose is 15 cents per pound. In the pending bill the duty on the flax yarn has been reduced to 25 per cent ad valorem and the duty on the finished article has been cut to 7 cents per pound; that is, the duty on the raw material of this product has been reduced less than 50 per cent, while the duty on the finished manufactured article has been reduced more than 50 per cent. Of course, it puts an absolutely undue burden on the finished article, and it is an improper adjustment of classification. I suppose, however, it is one of those illogical things demanded by common sense, of which there are so many in the bill, and that it is useless for me to attempt to get a proper adjustment of the duties.

I merely call attention to it as another instance of carrying to the extreme the principle of giving protection to the foreign manufacturer. I ask that there may be printed in connection with my remarks, without reading, a letter relating to the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MALDEN, MASS., April 21, 1913.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We have just received a copy of the Underwood tariff bill and we are vitally interested in Schedule J, items 283 and 287. If these items go through as they are reported in the bill, we will be compelled to close up our works and go out of business.

We import single flax yarns on which the duty originally was 45 per cent, and on hydraulic linen hose, the duty was 20 cents per pound. Under the Payne bill, the duty on flax yarns remained at 45 per cent, but on hydraulic linen hose it was reduced to 15 cents per pound. Under the Underwood bill, item 283, Schedule J, duty on flax yarn is 25 per cent ad valorem and on hydraulic linen hose, in same schedule, item 287, the duty is 7 cents per pound.

Now, Mr. Senator, our average duty on all the yarns which we import amounts to more than 7 cents per pound, so that we are actually discriminated against in this country if this bill goes through as laid down in this copy. In addition to the unfavorable duty we are up against the cheap and low labor of our foreign competitors who can outrun us for fair on this basis.

We hardly believe that such an unfair proposition will go through Congress, but it certainly is up to our Representatives to see that we get a fair show to do business in this country. All we ask is an equal chance and no favoritism. The truth of our assertions can be verified by getting information from the customs in regard to the duty and prices of imported linen yarns, and we certainly hope you will do what you can to aid us in getting a fair deal. If you think it advisable and will give us the names of the other Members of Congress and Senate, we will write them all a letter asking their cooperation.

Hoping that you will see the unfairness of this proposition and that you will assure us your cooperation in endeavoring to rectify this matter and thanking you for your attention, we remain

Yours, very truly,

CHAS. NIEDNER'S SONS CO.,
WM. NIEDNER, Treasurer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to recur to paragraph 282 and to call the attention of the Senate to the words in line 2, "(except cotton)." Does the Senator from Mississippi think that those words ought to be there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In what line?

Mr. SMOOT. The words "(except cotton)," in line 2, page 85. The Senator knows that the articles enumerated in paragraph 282 made of cotton are specifically provided for in paragraph 311 of the wool schedule. It does seem to me that there is no need of having the words "(except cotton)" in this paragraph, because cotton is taken care of, and these very items are covered by paragraph 311.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that same language was in the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we took it for granted, as we did in many instances in connection with this bill, that where the

language had been used in the old law the provision had probably been adjudicated, and having been determined it was better not to disturb it, unless there were some good reason for disturbing it.

Mr. SMOOT. It was put there because under the present law the method of assessing the duty is entirely different from that proposed in this bill, which puts the duty on an ad valorem basis. I do not know that the words will do any harm, but certainly they will do no good.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they will do no harm, let them stay in and let us go ahead.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 284, page 85, line 9, after the word "tapes," to strike out "25" and insert "20," so as to make the paragraph read:

284. Tapes composed wholly or in part of flax, woven with or without metal threads, on reels, spools, or otherwise, and designed expressly for use in the manufacture of measuring tapes, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraph 285, as follows:

285. Linoleum, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, including corticine and cork carpet, figured or plain, also linoleum known as granite and oak plank, 30 per cent ad valorem; inlaid linoleum, 35 per cent ad valorem; oilcloth for floors, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, 20 per cent ad valorem; mats or rugs made of oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet shall be subject to the same rate of duty as herein provided for oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before leaving paragraph 285, and in connection with inlaid linoleum, the Senator from Mississippi will remember that in the Dingley bill the words "inlaid linoleum" were first used, and from a month or two after the passage of that bill up to nearly the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill there was constant litigation over that term. I believe that if the expression "inlaid linoleum" is used again in this bill the same questions will arise; in fact, I have no doubt about it. I see the Senator shakes his head, but it has been decided that the wording in the present law takes in all of that class of linoleum which is known as and called "inlaid linoleum." If the words of the present law, "the composition of which forms designs or patterns, whether inlaid or otherwise," were used, litigation that ensued for years because of the use of the words "inlaid linoleum" would be obviated. While I am not asking for a change in duty, I feel positive that if that description is incorporated in the pending bill it will be better for the administration of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the case to which the Senator refers is the United States against Hunter, in One hundred and twenty-seventh Federal Reporter.

Mr. SMOOT. The case that I referred to, I think, was T. D. No. 30764; G. A. 7062.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is 20075, but it is on the same point. In this case it was held, affirming the circuit court and reversing the board decision, that so-called granite linoleum, made by spreading paste upon a burlap foundation and then subjecting the same to pressure, resulting in variously colored spots and masses, was not inlaid linoleum as that term is used in the tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. That was granite and oak-plank linoleum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, in the case of the United States against Scott (T. D. 29208) so-called plank linoleum or oak-plank linoleum, made by running paste of two colors in stripes of equal width upon a burlap foundation, were found to be produced by a different process from that employed in the manufacture of inlaid linoleum and were held not to be dutiable as inlaid linoleum. The House inserted in this clause:

Inlaid linoleum, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Then in that paragraph this language is found:

285. Linoleum, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, including corticine and cork carpet, figured or plain; also linoleum known as granite and oak plank, 30 per cent ad valorem.

So we mentioned it expressly in order to meet the decision. Now, it appears that this came about in the following way: Prior to the passage of the Dingley law there were only three kinds of linoleum known to the trade. One was plain linoleum made by pressing a colored paste upon the burlap—the burlap is the back of all linoleum; secondly, printed linoleum, upon which the desired pattern was printed; and then inlaid linoleum, made by pressing several colored pastes into the burlap. After the passage of the Dingley law two other linoleums became common in the trade; one was known as granite linoleum and the other was known as oak-plank linoleum, the process of making which I have just read from this decision. The language "inlaid linoleum" led to litigation under the old law, owing to the fact that this granite and oak-plank linoleum came into the trade later. Now, we have prevented the possi-

bility of future litigation as to the meaning of "inlaid linoleum" by mentioning *ex nomine* granite and oak-plank linoleum; so that I do not see how any litigation in regard to it can come in the future. If we had merely repeated the language "inlaid linoleum" there might have been some lawsuits—some litigation about it—though I do not see precisely how, because the courts have already settled the point at issue. At any rate, out of a superabundance of caution we name granite and oak plank. The courts have held that these two last—granite and oak-plank linoleums—were not inlaid linoleums within the meaning of the Dingley law. So we have given them by their own names this duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my only aim in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is that immediately after the decisions to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, and up to the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, there were suits pending upon every conceivable technicality. It is for that reason that I have called the Senator's attention to it. If the words "the composition of which forms designs or patterns, whether inlaid or otherwise," were used, there would be no question as to the meaning or description. If the Senator does not care about accepting my suggestion, well and good, but I am positive those words ought to be inserted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the language here used will cause litigation any more than that in the present law, though I do not know.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 287, page 85, line 23, after the word "wholly," to strike out "or in chief value"; on page 86, line 1, after the word "wholly," to strike out "or in chief value"; and on the same page, in line 3, after the word "rubber," to strike out "50" and insert "40," so as to make the paragraph read:

287. Bands, bandings, belts, beltings, bindings, cords, ribbons, tapes, webs and webbings, all the foregoing composed wholly of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, and not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem; wearing apparel composed wholly of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 288, page 86, line 5, after the word "known," to insert "bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or rendered noninflammable by any process," so as to make the paragraph read:

288. Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or rendered noninflammable by any process, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment being agreed to, but I merely want to speak on the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to this paragraph in connection with paragraph 290. This paragraph covers the fabrics of which the articles in paragraph 290 are made. What are commonly known as burlap and bags are covered by paragraph 290, burlap bags being made from burlap. The House seems to have had some faint conception of the fact that the duty on the completed fabric bore a certain relation to the raw material. They made the duty on the burlap 20 per cent and on the bags 25 per cent. The Senate committee, in its wisdom, has cut down the duty on the bags to 10 per cent and left the duty on the plain woven cloth 20 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. The unbleached fabrics have been placed upon the free list.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that bags were made of these plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns by whatever name known. Do I understand that they are made only of the unbleached fabrics?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will notice the difference between the two. Paragraph 288 covers the material when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or rendered noninflammable, and paragraph 290 covers it when not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, bleached, and so forth.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. SHIVELY. The material of which the articles mentioned in paragraph 290 are made is on the free list in paragraph 416.

Mr. LODGE. I have not examined paragraph 416 of the free list. If that has been done, of course that has made it right.

Mr. SMOOT. That makes the differential between the burlap and the bag 10 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. That makes the differential.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will notice that the House—

Mr. LODGE. I see that an amendment has been made by the Senate to paragraph 416 in the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. They made a different differential, which makes the correction necessary.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but it lowers the duty, in my judgment, far beyond the proper point. I desire in this connection, while I will not read it, to put in a statement in regard to the cost of these articles. Of course, this applies to the House provision; but it gives the cost of the articles, and I should like to have it printed. I had overlooked the amendment in the free list which, of course, establishes a differential, as the Senator says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the matter referred to will be printed.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BOSTON, April 9, 1913.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit us to call your attention to paragraphs Nos. 292 and 294 of House bill No. 10, placing a duty of 25 per cent on both burlap and burlap bags.

As manufacturers, we consider that in all fairness our product of burlap bags should carry a different rate than our raw material (which is burlap), for the reason that we are in competition with the manufacturer in Calcutta, where labor is the cheapest in the world.

While we advocate a specific duty, the ad valorem rate of 25 per cent on bags would be no hardship, provided the rate on burlaps be reduced at least to 17½ per cent ad valorem. This is merely to equalize the difference in labor cost between India and the United States and allow us to continue to compete with the mills in Calcutta.

During the past eight years the equivalent ad valorem rate on burlap has been 24 per cent and on bags 30 per cent, and at the present time over 10 per cent of the burlap bags consumed in this country are imported, chiefly from India, showing conclusively that we are now on a competitive basis in this industry, which is not sectional, bag factories being distributed throughout all portions of the United States.

This bill actually advances the rate on burlap, which is unwarranted, as its use is general throughout the country for various purposes.

May we ask your careful perusal of the inclosed printed facts bearing on this subject?

Trusting you will use your influence to have the item changed in the bill as suggested, and thanking you for the consideration you may give to the matter, we have the honor to remain,

Yours, respectfully,

H. & L. CHASE.

NEW YORK CITY, January 17, 1913.

To the honorable Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned committee, representing 22 of the principal manufacturers of cloth bags or sacks in all sections of the United States, having factories in 21 different States, and indirectly representing 10,000 workers, and through them 20,000 dependents, respectfully but insistently make the following statement and recommendations in regard to paragraphs 352 and 354 of the present tariff act, effective August 6, 1909:

The two or three persons who will present this petition to you are but two or three out of approximately 10,000 persons employed in this industry; these 10,000 provide a livelihood for approximately 20,000 dependents. To transfer employment from any number of these 10,000 workers to foreign labor would take away the means of livelihood from a corresponding number of consumers. There are approximately 30,000 people in the United States who are dependent upon this industry, and this petition is made informally in their behalf.

ARTICLES DESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPHS 352 AND 354.

The goods described in paragraph 352 are known in this country as burlaps.

The goods described in paragraph 354 are known in this country as burlap bags.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

As to paragraph 352: Any rate of duty between free entry and the rate under the present law would be satisfactory to the bag manufacturers, provided a proper differential were maintained between paragraphs 352 and 354. However, it is the judgment of the bag manufacturers that a moderate duty on burlaps forms a proper and substantial source of revenue, without injury to any industry; and, therefore, that at least a portion of the present duty should be retained. Burlaps compete with coarse cotton cloth, and this is an additional reason for maintaining at least a portion of the present duty.

As to paragraph 354: The present differential between paragraphs 352 and 354 should be maintained or increased and under no circumstances should it be reduced. It is the equivalent, approximately, of three-eighths of a cent per pound (specific), or 6 per cent (ad valorem). This differential is already a competitive marginal duty, as proved in two ways: First, by a comparison of labor and wages in the United States and foreign countries, especially India, against which country 12 per cent differential would not be too much; second, by the importations of bags—roughly, 15 per cent of all those used in this country—and with a tendency already for such importations to increase.

RATES.

At a meeting held in New York January 17, 1913, attended by the representatives of 12 prominent burlap-bag manufacturing concerns, it was the unanimous opinion that our first choice for rates would be:

	Cents per pound.
Burlaps, paragraph 352	1
Bags, paragraph 354	1½
Based on Treasury statistics for eight years ending June 30, 1912, these rates would reduce the revenue:	
Under paragraph 352	\$1,700,000
Under paragraph 354	120,000
Total	1,820,000

It was also the unanimous opinion that the duty on burlaps and burlap bags ought to be specific, and we understand that the collectors of customs, who are well informed on the point, would strongly favor a specific duty.

The principal ports of entry for burlaps are New York, Boston, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Portland, Oreg. If you would ask the Board of General Appraisers and the collectors at these five ports, we think they would be unanimous in recommending specific duty for burlaps. It would save the Government and the importers an enormous amount of trouble and expense, and, we believe, would not harm anyone.

But the extra trouble and expense of doing business under ad valorem duties are of less importance to us than would be the loss of our business, resulting from a reduction in the present differential between paragraphs 352 and 354. We can get along with compound ad valorem and specific duties if we must, and it is not of great importance to us whether the duty on the burlap cloth is somewhat more or less than 1 cent per pound; that item would be chiefly a matter of revenue. But we can not get along if the difference between paragraphs 352 and 354 is reduced. A reduction in the already small competitive difference of 6 per cent now existing might mean our extermination, and on no account should this difference be diminished.

BAG MANUFACTURERS' FIRST CHOICE FOR RATES OF DUTY.

AS THE LAW NOW IS.

SEC. 352. Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, weighing not less than 6 ounces per square yard, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, nine-sixteenths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; if exceeding 30 and not exceeding 55 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.

SEC. 354. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.

AS THE LAW SHOULD BE.

SEC. 352. Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, weighing not less than 6 ounces per square yard, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1 cent per pound; if exceeding 30 and not exceeding 55 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.

SEC. 354. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1 cent per pound.

CHANGES IN IMPORTATIONS SHOULD THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATIONS BE FOLLOWED.

There would be no material change in the volume of importations of burlaps or bags if the foregoing suggestions were followed, because the present relation of burlaps and bags to competing articles would not be materially altered. But if the present differential between burlaps and bags were diminished it would undoubtedly result in increased importations of bags, with a corresponding reduction in burlaps. In just such degree would American laborers engaged in this industry be forced to compete for work in other lines. The only possible result of such a condition in this and other industries would be a general lowering of wages in this country.

We wish to emphasize the statement that a considerable portion of the burlap bags used in this country is imported from abroad, because the present difference between the rate of duty on bags and the rate of duty on burlap cloth is too small to enable the American manufacturers to compete with Calcutta. The importation of these bags proves that the present difference is not protective and is only competitive. Any reduction in this difference would deprive the American manufacturer of the opportunity to compete with Calcutta. We understand your honorable committee wishes to establish competitive rates and does not intend to deprive the American manufacturer of the opportunity to compete. We respectfully urge you not to make any reduction in this difference, which is already too small to allow us to get more than a fair share of the business. Any reduction in this difference would prevent us from holding that portion of the business which we are now able to get.

We further recommend adhering to the present phraseology of paragraphs 352 and 354 as far as possible. Any radical change in classification such as that contained in the so-called "farmers' free-list bill" (H. R. 4413, 62d Cong.) would be confusing and possibly disastrous, without apparent advantage of any kind. The meaning of the present phraseology has been defined by 15 years of entries. It should not be changed in its fundamental construction.

Under House bill 4413, Sixty-second Congress, goods described as follows would have been put on the free list:

"—gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, —, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton, and burlaps, —, or other materials suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products."

The figures submitted for the present use of the Ways and Means Committee in a pamphlet entitled *Tariff Handbook* indicate that your honorable body has no conception of the articles that might have been given free entry under the above classification. Not only would free entry have been accorded to the articles referred to in paragraphs 352, 354, and 355, but an indefinite, indescribable, incalculable quantity and variety of other materials now covered in other paragraphs of Schedules I and J and possibly even Schedule K. There have been rulings of the Board of General Appraisers regarding the entry of goods classified under the phraseology "suitable for, etc.," that indicate clearly the wide and dangerous and indefinite scope of such classification for tariff purposes.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

Our recommendations, then, are not so much requests for protection as they are protests against the abrogation of the present competitive duty, which we require in order to continue in business. Radical changes in the classification or descriptive phraseology should be avoided if possible.

Statement of average yearly importations of burlap cloth and burlap bags for 8 years ending June 30, 1912, showing weight and value and the amount of duty under the present law compared with what the amount would be under the proposed change.

[These figures were obtained from Treasury Department statistics and are accurate and reliable.]

	Burlap cloth. ¹	Burlap bags. ²
WEIGHT.		
Average yearly imports during the 8 years ending June 30, 1912.....pounds..	351,147,013	50,073,223
VALUE.		
Average yearly imports during the 8 years ending June 30, 1912.....	\$21,855,107	\$2,911,137
Ad valorem equivalent of present duty.....	24+	30+
Amount of duty at present rate.....	\$5,253,465	\$874,811
Ad valorem equivalent of rate now proposed, per cent.....	16+	26+
Amount of duty as it would be under proposed rate.....	\$3,511,470	\$751,098
Loss of revenue.....	\$1,741,995	\$123,713
Ad valorem equivalent of reduction in rate of duty, per cent.....	8+	4+

¹ Not exceeding 30 threads per square inch. Paragraph 352.

² Paragraph 354.

SIZE AND EXTENT OF CLOTH-BAG-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY.

This industry is generally considered a small one. It is neither small nor local. The following list gives the States in which the larger factories are located, with the number of such factories in each:

California.....	3
Georgia.....	2
Illinois.....	2
Indiana.....	2
Kentucky.....	2
Louisiana.....	1
Maryland.....	4
Massachusetts.....	1
Minnesota.....	1
Missouri.....	2
Nebraska.....	5
New Jersey.....	1
New York.....	1
North Carolina.....	6
Ohio.....	1
Oregon.....	1
Pennsylvania.....	2
Tennessee.....	1
Texas.....	3
Washington.....	2
Wisconsin.....	1

According to the statistics of manufactures of the United States, Thirteenth Census, 1910, the cloth-bag-manufacturing industry (which is listed under "Bags, other than paper") held the following position in 1909:

	Number of industries larger.	Number of industries smaller.	Rank expressed in per cent.
In number of establishments.....	138	118	46
In persons engaged in industry.....	96	161	62
In number salaried employees.....	119	138	53
In number wage earners.....	94	163	63
In capital invested.....	93	164	64
In salaries paid.....	117	140	54
In wages paid.....	110	147	57
In cost materials used.....	49	203	81
In value products made.....	66	191	74
In value added by manufacture.....	109	148	58
Average.....	99	158	61

It is clear from the foregoing that this industry demands your careful consideration. It has been developed during the past half century under tariff laws favorable to its growth. It is clearly upon a competitive tariff basis now. It deserves a continuation of that basis to just the same extent that other industries are accorded it.

REASONS WHY THERE SHOULD BE A DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN PARAGRAPHS 352 AND 354.

The principal point of manufacture of burlap, which is the bag manufacturers' raw material, is in Calcutta, India. The Indian manufacturers of burlap would like also to manufacture the bags. Enough, perhaps, is known regarding the difference in conditions of employment, hours of labor, and wages in this country and in India to make unnecessary any further reference here. However, the following table may serve to make perfectly clear the fact that no difference in methods or atmosphere or scenery can, unaided by a protective duty, put American labor on a competitive basis with Indian labor.

	United States of America.	India.
Average hours per week.....	54	72
Average sewers' wages per week.....	\$9.00	\$0.66
Average hemmers' wages per week.....	9.00	.45
"Learners".....	5.00	.40

Figures already given show that under the present differential there are importations of bags in considerable volume, and therefore that there is certainly no prohibition of importations from abroad nor monopoly for the American manufacturer in the present rates.

It has always been assumed that the consumer of burlap bags is confined exclusively to those engaged in agricultural pursuits. This is entirely wrong. We do not disguise the fact that the farmer is to some extent a user of burlap bags, but only to a very small extent. The grains and cereals from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean are handled by the farmer in bulk, and only a very small quantity of bags is used in this section for the purpose of moving the crops. From the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific coast grain is moved partly in sacks, partly in bulk, though the tendency toward the bulk movement of grain is strong, and it is freely predicted that within a short time after the opening of the Panama Canal the Pacific slope will handle all its grain in bulk. Eliminating the Pacific coast, which we believe will soon be on a bulk basis, the farmer is a user of bags in a very restricted sense, largely as a consumer of the goods he buys, rather than of the goods he sells, and we do not see what material benefit would result to him by a reduction in duty on bags which are merely used as covers for articles which he purchases.

Furthermore, the products of this country for which bags are used as containers or conveyers are consumed almost entirely at home. This is clearly shown by the comparatively small "drawbacks" applied for upon bags exported filled with American product.

It is clear, therefore, that, even if the removal of the present differential should result in a slightly lower cost of burlap bags to the bag consumers of this country, it would not materially benefit such consumers, and the retention of the industry in this country is justified.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, therefore, we respectfully petition that, for the good of this country, for the greatest good to the greatest number, and for the preservation of the industry which we represent, the present differential of 6 per cent between paragraphs 352 and 354 should be increased rather than reduced.

Respectfully submitted.

Everett Ames, chairman (Ames-Harris-Neville Co., Portland, Oreg.); Benjamin Elsas (Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga.); Albert F. Bemis (Bemis Bro. Bag Co., St. Louis, Mo.); Committee, representing Ames-Harris-Neville Co., Portland, Oreg.; American Bag Co., Memphis, Tenn.; Bemis Bro. Bag Co., St. Louis, Mo.; H. & L. Chase, Boston, Mass.; H. & L. Chase Bag Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Cleveland-Akron Bag Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga.; J. C. Grafflin Co., Baltimore, Md.; E. S. Halsted & Co., New York City; Hardwood Manufacturing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Percy Kent Co., New York City; Mente & Co., New Orleans, La.; Milwaukee Bag Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Morgan & Hamilton Co., Nashville, Tenn.; M. J. Neahr & Co., Chicago, Ill.; W. C. Noon Bag Co. (Inc.), Portland, Oreg.; Philadelphia Bag Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; C. H. Parsons Co., New York City; Herman Reach & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Riegel Sack Co., Jersey City, N. J.; J. S. Walker & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Willard Bag & Manufacturing Co., Wilmington, N. C.

Paragraphs 352, 353, and 354, present tariff law.

BOSTON, MASS., February 7, 1913.

HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,

Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is sent with the purpose of supplementing the information supplied by the brief filed with the committee under Schedule I and printed on pages 3220 and 3221 of Tariff Schedule No. 14, Hearings, etc., and under Schedule J, pages 3512 to 3516, Tariff Schedule No. 16, Hearings, etc., also in the hope of clarifying the following points regarding the tariff on cloth sacks that were left indefinite at the hearings before your committee January 22 to 25, inclusive:

- Selling methods.
- Use of cloth sacks by farmers.
- Comparative manufacturing costs, United States and elsewhere.

POINT A.

There is no "trust" or combination of any kind, either for the purchase of raw material or selling of finished product, among the cloth-sack manufacturers of the United States. There is no "water" in the capitalization of this industry. In the distribution of the product there are no middlemen. Ninety-nine per cent of the product is sold by the sack manufacturers direct to consumers.

POINT B.

Consumption of new sacks by farmers.

COTTON SACKS.

Number produced and sold annually in the United States.....	600,000,000
Number used directly for sacking agricultural products (or 1 per cent).....	6,000,000
Number "commercially suitable" for sacking agricultural products.....	500,000,000

It is clear from the above that there would be no material benefit to the farmer from placing cotton sacks on the free list, even if it were possible to do so without gross injustice to the manufacturers of cotton cloth and sacks.

JUTE SACKS.

Estimate of burlap sacks manufactured in United States of America and imported annually, also classification of same as to use.

MADE AND IMPORTED.

Burlap sacks manufactured annually in the United States.....	450,000,000
Burlap sacks imported annually, chiefly from India.....	55,000,000

Total burlap sacks consumed annually in the United States.....	505,000,000
--	-------------

CLASSIFICATION OF USE.

Factory products:	
Bran and other mill stuffs.....	200,000,000
Fertilizer.....	50,000,000
Flour (mostly export).....	28,000,000
Sugar.....	23,000,000
Packing-house products.....	10,000,000
All other factory products.....	69,000,000
	380,000,000
Farm products:	
Wheat, corn, and oats (domestic sacks).....	35,000,000
Wheat (foreign sacks).....	50,000,000
All other farm products (domestic sacks).....	35,000,000
All other farm products (foreign sacks).....	5,000,000
	125,000,000

Total factory and farm products..... 505,000,000

The following table gives the production in 1912 of the three principal cereal crops of the United States, the rate of protective duty on each under the present law, and the approximate amount of each crop sacked:

Crop.	Bushels.	Protected by duty of—	Estimated amount sacked.	Per cent sacked.
		Per bushel.	Bushels.	
Corn.....	3,124,746,000	\$0.15	4,000,000	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Wheat.....	730,267,000	.25	96,000,000	13%
Oats.....	1,418,337,000	.15	125,000,000	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Total.....	5,273,350,000		225,000,000	4.26%

It is clear from this table that over 95 per cent in volume of the three principal cereal crops of the United States is handled without sacking, only 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent being handled in sacks of domestic manufacture, and 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in sacks of foreign manufacture.

Proportionately less of these cereals each year is sacked. It will probably be but a short time before 99 per cent of the three principal cereal crops of the United States is handled in bulk.

Fully 99 per cent of the agricultural products of this country which are handled in sacks (whole grains, seeds, potatoes, nuts, onions, etc.) is dutiable under the present tariff at a rough average of 25 per cent ad valorem.

Inasmuch as only 5 per cent of the agricultural products of the United States is sacked, and inasmuch as those products that are sacked have the benefit of a 25 per cent protective duty, wherein is a reasonable competitive duty on sacks any burden to the producer of agricultural products?

The sack manufacturers of this country should be given the same measure of protection or competitive rates of duty as may be granted any other manufacturers.

POINT C.

COMPARATIVE MANUFACTURING COSTS, UNITED STATES AND ELSEWHERE.

There were one or two inaccurate and very general statements made orally at the hearings on January 24 and 25 regarding the cost of manufacturing burlap sacks in this country and the chief competing country, India. Below find a statement of costs, the correctness of which we would be glad to prove if desired.

Actual cost of making in the United States during the past year 89,835,000 plain, unprinted burlap sacks, \$5.49 per 1,000.

Average charge by Calcutta mills over the cost of the burlap cloth for making burlap sacks, as per quotations and purchases of June 8, 1910, August 2, 1910, July 18, 1911, and October 24, 1912, \$1.60 per 1,000.

Difference against United States manufacture, \$3.89 per 1,000.

This difference equals 0.39 cent per bag.

This difference equals approximately 0.52 cent per pound.

This difference at lowest market price equals 10 per cent ad valorem maximum.

This difference at highest market price equals 5-per cent ad valorem minimum.

This difference at average market price equals 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem average.

It is clear from the above that the present differential of about 6 per cent ad valorem, or three-eighths cent per pound specific, is the minimum which would enable the manufacturer in this country to compete with India. Especially would this be true should a comparison be made between the necessarily high labor cost of manufacturing on our Pacific coast, where the manufacturers of this country are at a very much greater disadvantage in competing with India and need a differential of 12 per cent. The figures given above as the cost in the United States are an average between factories operating in several different parts of the country.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT AND CONCLUSIONS.

1. The cloth-sack industry of the United States is properly conducted, and is as much entitled to fully competitive rates as any other industry.

2. Only about 1 per cent of the cotton-cloth sacks is used for sacking the direct products of the farm, and not more than 25 per cent of the burlap sacks.

3. Practically all farm products that are sacked are dutiable, and only 5 per cent of such products is sacked. The present duties on burlaps and burlap sacks are in no sense a burden to the farmer.

4. The present differential between burlaps and burlap sacks is the minimum permissible as figured from the average cost of manufacturing in this country and the cost in foreign countries.

The above data, in our judgment, still further support the rates recommended in the brief of the bag manufacturers' committee, found on pages 3512 to 3516, Tariff Schedules No. 16, Hearings, etc. (1 cent per pound on burlaps under par. 352 and 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound on sacks, par. 354), and we further urge your favorable consideration of those recommendations.

Very respectfully submitted.

ALBERT F. BEMIS,
President Bemis Bro. Bag Co.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 289, page 86, line 9, after the word "flax," to insert "hemp, or ramie"; in line 10, after the word "flax," to insert "hemp, or ramie"; and in line 12, after the word "section," to strike out "45" and insert "40," so as to make the paragraph read:

289. All pile fabrics, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, composed of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which flax, hemp, or ramie is the component material of chief value, and all articles and manufactures made from such fabrics, not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 290, page 86, line 16, after the word "bleached," to strike out "25" and insert "10," so as to make the paragraph read:

290. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 86, at the end of line 16, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That jute grain bags, known commercially as standard Calcutta 22-inch by 22-inch grain bags, shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. JONES. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the situation to which this amendment applies.

The amendment is intended to admit, free, wheat grain bags which are especially used on the Pacific coast. I think possibly the bags described in the amendment are used there alone. The situation is that most of the wheat that we export or ship out of the country raised in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, must be shipped in sacks. Practically all of these sacks are imported from Calcutta. There are from six to seven and a half million made on the coast in two or three factories that are found there and in the various State penitentiaries where they have bag factories. In our State penitentiary we have one that supplies, I think, three or four million of these sacks a year. But in addition to what are produced on the coast we must import from thirty-five to forty or forty-five million of these sacks every year to handle our own crop.

These sacks may be termed simply a vehicle of export because they are brought into the country for the sole purpose of sacking the wheat and carrying it out. The farmer must buy the sacks. When he sells his wheat he simply sells the wheat with the sack, and gets practically nothing for the sack, and it goes out of the country. For the next year's crop he must again import sacks and pay for the sacks, and then they go out carrying his wheat as a vehicle of export. Every dollar of duty placed on such sacks is simply that much of a tax upon the farmer for exporting his wheat.

In the imports under this item it will be noticed that while there is some variation, they range along practically the same from year to year. For instance, under the Wilson bill, when they were admitted free, we imported over 41,000,000 in number; and I see that in a note here it says these were bags for grain. So that that import represents practically what is covered by the amendment I have offered. In 1905, when they had a duty of seven-eighths of 1 cent a pound, we imported 37,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They not only had a duty of seven-eighths of a cent a pound, but they had that plus 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES. Yes; that is true. There was an additional rate.

I have found that the production of wheat in the Pacific coast States since 1896 has been practically the same. There has been some variation, a few million bushels, year by year; but the variation has been very much the same as the variation in the imports. In 1910, with the duty the same as it was in 1905, the imports were over 60,000,000. Then, in 1912, the imports went down again to 46,000,000, corresponding very nearly, though not entirely, to the variation in the production of wheat; and I think it will be found, also, varying with the manufacture of these bags in the factories on the coast and in the penitentiaries.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. SHIVELY. Under the Wilson bill, while bags were on the free list, the burlaps of which the bags were made were subjected to a duty. Bags are taxed in the present law. If the Senator will observe, in this bill the material out of which the bags are made is placed upon the free list.

Mr. JONES. I know; that is true.

Mr. SHIVELY. The duty on the bag has been reduced to 10 per cent, and, of course, on all exports you will have the benefit of the drawback clause.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the drawback applies where the sack is manufactured abroad and brought in here simply to carry out wheat in. It is not brought in and manufactured after it gets in here. The Senator from Massachusetts says that the burlaps were free under the Wilson bill as well as the bags. I am satisfied that we have never received the benefit of any drawback clause on the bags that are imported into this country, and I am satisfied we would not get it under this provision.

Mr. SHIVELY. Will the Senator permit me a moment further?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SHIVELY. In section O of the administrative part of the bill there is a provision as follows—

Mr. JONES. On what page?

Mr. SHIVELY. Page 268:

That upon the exportation of articles manufactured or produced in the United States by the use of imported merchandise or materials upon which customs duties have been paid, the full amount of such duties paid upon the quantity of materials used in the manufacture or production of the exported product shall be refunded as drawback—

And so forth.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but these bags are not manufactured in this country to any extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They will be now.

Mr. JONES. I think not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will show you.

Mr. JONES. We can not compete with the Calcutta people. I am satisfied of that. With the differential under this bill our people can not compete. Under the Payne-Aldrich law we had a greater differential than you are giving us now between the duty on the burlap and the duty on the sack. The differential is greater than the differential that you allow here; so that we will not be able to manufacture these sacks. We can not do it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a brief statement?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I should like to say, for the information of the Senator, that a member of the firm who are the largest manufacturers of bags on the Pacific coast called upon me here while this matter was before the Finance Committee for consideration and assured me that if they were allowed the opportunity they could and would make all the bags required for the entire supply of this country.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I met the gentleman, and I also met him when the Payne-Aldrich bill was up. I find that under the differential allowed by that bill he has not been able to increase his product to any considerable extent, if any, at all. So I am satisfied that our people can not produce these bags in competition with the Calcutta people so as to come anywhere near supplying the quantity required. Therefore I say that whatever duty you levy on these bags is simply that much of a tax upon the farmer for exporting his wheat.

You estimate that you will raise \$320,000 revenue under this paragraph. That \$320,000 is simply that much of a tax placed upon a vehicle of export used in exporting the farmer's product. He can not possibly recover it in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator allow one question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. These bags, as I understand, are of a peculiar shape—a peculiar construction. They are not like the grain sacks that are used in the Eastern States?

Mr. JONES. I think not at all. They are of a peculiar character of construction, especially suitable for export.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And used only for the export business?

Mr. JONES. Only for the export business. That is all they are used for.

I offered an amendment to the Payne-Aldrich law when it was up, because it seemed to me there was no principle of protection involved and that as a revenue proposition it ought not to be imposed on the farmer. Of course it was voted down; but I am glad to say that some of my Democratic friends voted for it at that time, who I hope will vote for this amendment at this time. Those who voted for it when the Payne-Aldrich bill was pending were Senators BACON, BANKHEAD, CHAMBERLAIN, FLETCHER, FOSTER, FRAZIER, GORE, HUGHES, JOHNSTON, OVERMAN, OWEN, SHIVELY, STONE, and TILMAN.

I really can see no justification for this tariff. I am satisfied that these facts and conditions probably were not called to the attention of the committee or of the members in caucus. But that is the situation. Our farmers must have these bags. They are not produced in our country, and I am satisfied that they will not be produced here. We can not compete with the Calcutta manufacturers of these grain bags. They are absolutely required in the export of our wheat. It does seem to me that an article brought into this country especially to aid us in exporting should not be burdened with a tariff.

I hope the Senator in charge of this schedule will feel disposed to accept this amendment; or, if not entirely satisfied as to what should be done, I should be glad to have him pass it over and have it reconsidered by the committee, in view of the facts I have presented.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator that I have no objection, and after consultation with other Senators here we have no objection, to carrying the matter to the committee.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I wish to say to the Senator, because it ought to be now said, on the record, that he is totally mistaken about the condition under the Payne-Aldrich bill, as he will see if he will examine the differential.

The tax under paragraph 352 of the Payne-Aldrich bill is nine-sixteenths of 1 cent per pound, and added to that 15 per cent ad valorem. Then, coming to section 354, which deals with bags or sacks, the rate of the Payne-Aldrich bill is seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. The only difference is the difference between seven-eighths and nine-sixteenths.

Mr. JONES. I think the Senator will find that that is more than 10 per cent. I will look into that, however; and meanwhile I am glad to have it go to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have to be pretty cheap stuff.

Mr. JONES. It is cheap stuff. It is only 3 or 4 cents a sack.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Seven-eighths, of course, is fourteen-sixteenths; the other is nine-sixteenths; and the difference between the two is only five-sixteenths. Now we have made free the cloth out of which these bags are to be made.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we have reduced down to 10 per cent the duty, which under the Payne-Aldrich bill was seven-eighths of a cent per pound plus 15 per cent ad valorem, and which under the bill as it came to us from the House was 25 per cent. We have reduced it by 15 per cent. We came to the conclusion that if there were any people here getting this stuff and making bags and sacks out of it, we wanted to give them some little differential between the cloth and the bag or sack. We thought 10 per cent was a very small one. We thought it was so small, in fact, that if the farmer was particularly industrious he would just get his supply of this stuff and cut it up and make his own bags out of it himself at less than these people would take the cloth and make the bag or sack out of it and let him have it; and we would disturb existing conditions that much less than we otherwise would do, while not granting anything above, really, a rather small revenue tax. The calculation is that we would get \$320,000 a year for the Treasury out of it. Last year, under the Payne-Aldrich bill, \$847,000 was covered into the Treasury from this source.

Mr. JONES. The main argument urged against my amendment when the Payne-Aldrich bill was up was that it would bring no revenue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was going to say that we reduce the revenue half a million; it may be over.

Mr. JONES. I know the Senator has done that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We reduce it five hundred and fifty-odd thousand dollars. Of course, when it comes to throwing away a little revenue here, and a little revenue there, and a little more in the other place, it carries a small amount in each place; but when you get through with it you have got to make it up somehow.

Mr. JONES. That is true, but if the conditions are as I have stated, and I am satisfied they are that way, I know the Senator realizes the injustice of placing a tariff upon the article.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I said was in defense of what we have done. But we will take the matter under consideration.

Mr. JONES. I did not intend to criticize the action of the committee because I knew that was the purpose of it, and I applaud that purpose. I will be glad to let the amendment go over that the committee may give it consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What is the cost of the bags?

Mr. JONES. The cost of the bags to the farmer himself is 6 and 7 cents and up to 11 and 12 cents a sack.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What is the cost laid down in this country?

Mr. JONES. The cost according to the items here I do not know. They claim that the Calcutta people can lay sacks down at about 7 cents apiece.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator want the actual cost as laid down at the port upon which they are appraised?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1896 it was 3.8 cents; in 1905, 4.7 cents; in 1910, 4.8 cents; and in 1912, 6.3 cents per bag or sack.

Mr. JONES. That is per pound?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the average unit. The quantity is given in pounds.

Mr. JONES. The quantity is given in pounds, and that is per pound according to my recollection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is per pound. I do not know how many pounds it would take to make a sack.

Mr. JONES. I understand that the sacks are imported for about 6 or 7 cents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the price at which they appraise the duty at the port?

Mr. JONES. That is the price they import them at ordinarily; they can do it at that price.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Government appraises them at so much a pound. Is that the way the farmers buy them? The Calcutta people sell them, I suppose, at so much a hundred.

Mr. JONES. At so much a hundred sacks.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was trying to get at our real commercial value of the sack itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In America?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. In America.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at the port of entry?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, at the port of entry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After the duty was paid?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. After the duty was paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I misunderstood the Senator. I did not understand that he was trying to get that fact.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I was trying to get at what the farmers pay for the sacks.

Mr. JONES. The amendment will go over, then.

Mr. SIMMONS. And let the Secretary proceed with the reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the amendment is to be referred back to the committee?

Mr. JONES. The amendment is to be referred to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Chair is that paragraph 290 goes over, that the amendment of the Senator from Washington will be referred to the committee, and that the committee amendment will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection, and it is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 292, page 86, line 25, before the word "fabrics," to strike out "Plain woven" and insert "Woven"; and on page 87, line 2, after the word "cloth," to strike out "35" and insert "30," so as to make the paragraph read:

292. Woven fabrics, not including articles, finished or unfinished, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, including such as is known as shirting cloth, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 293, page 87, line 4, before the word "woven," to strike out "All" and insert "Damasks and all"; in line 6, before the word "which," to strike out "of" and insert "into"; in the same line, after "which," to insert "two or more of"; in line 7, after the word "substances," to strike out "or any of them, is the component material of chief value" and insert "enter"; in line 8, after the word "section," to strike out "40" and insert "35"; and in line 9, after the words "ad valorem," to insert "woven figured upholstery goods, of which the component material of chief value is flax, hemp, or ramie, 35 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

293. Damasks and all woven articles, finished or unfinished, and all manufactures of flax, hemp, ramie, or other vegetable fiber, or into which two or more of these substances enter, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; woven figured upholstery goods, of which the component material of chief value is flax, hemp, or ramie, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

294. Istle or Tampico, when dressed, dyed, or combed, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator who has this matter in charge to paragraph 423, page 130.

You have put there on the free list all binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, manilla, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, and so forth. Here in paragraph 294 you tax the principal one of these ingredients, the one that comes nearest to sisal grass. You put a 20 per cent duty on it when it is dressed or combed. Of course it has got to be dressed or combed before it is made into twine, and you put a burden on the binding twine by putting on it this ad valorem rate of 20 per cent.

I call your attention to it. If you mean to give the farmers free binding twine you certainly ought not to impose this duty on istle or Tampico. If you turn to paragraph 423 on the free list, you will find that it is one of the items that goes to make binding twine. It is the fiber which is produced in Central America, and it is said to be fully as good as sisal grass. I suggest to the committee, if you aim to give the farmer free binding twine you certainly ought not to tax his raw material 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator think that binding twine is made of this istle after it is dressed and dyed?

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it is made after it is dyed, but of course it has got to be dressed or combed before it can be spun into twine. The first process is dressing it or combing it before you finish the twine. It would be all right if you limit it to dyed. It is not dyed in twine. It is the words "dressed or combed" to which I refer. You ought not to put a tax of 20 per cent ad valorem on it because it is one of the elements of which binding twine is made. If you intend to give the farmer any benefit of that material, you ought to eliminate the tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Paragraph 294 is identical—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly; I abandon the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. NELSON. Certainly; I will answer the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. NELSON. No; I simply said to the Senator from Mississippi, or whoever has the schedule in charge, if you intend to give the farmers free binding twine in good faith and give them the full benefit, you ought not to put a tax of 20 per cent ad valorem on one of the main raw materials, so to speak, that enter into the binding twine.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Vermont will pardon me, will the Senator from Minnesota permit an interruption for a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow me just a word?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator from Minnesota will find, I believe, that the farmers are not materially injured if they have the istle in the raw state. Istle in the condition in which we receive it under this paragraph of the bill is something that enters into the manufacture of brushes.

I want to say that one of the leading industries of the little city of Burlington, in my State, is one which prepares istle for brushes. This matter was thrashed out very thoroughly four years ago on the Payne-Aldrich bill, and it was thought by giving 20 per cent on that which had been combed you would protect that industry, whereas if you take it in free in the raw you will give the farmer practically all he needs.

Mr. NELSON. But before it can be used in binding twine, it has to be dressed and combed. That is the first process.

Mr. PAGE. But that can be done in this country without any difficulty. We can dress it and comb it here. On the other hand, if you permit it to be brought in, as I think the leading manufacturers of brushes and combs are in Belgium, they will send it in and compete with our people here who prepare the raw material for brushes.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota, before he attacks an industry which is so important to Vermont, will look up and see if it is not fully protected when he gets the material in the rough for the farmers' purpose.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am not attacking the industry, nor do I offer any amendment. I simply say to the Senators on the other side who have the bill in charge, that if they intend to give the farmers the full benefit of free binding twine there ought not to be any tax on this fiber. That is my view of it. I shall offer no amendment and make no obstruction or cause delay. I simply make it by way of suggestion to the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is one of the few things in which we have adopted bodily the language of the Payne-Aldrich bill. The House adopted it.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, I will say I have no doubt it is oftentimes dangerous to adopt the language of that bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about that; but if the Senator had listened to me for a moment, he would have found out why I made that remark and then his remark would have been unnecessary. This is one of the few particulars in which we adopted the language of the Payne-Aldrich bill in both paragraphs. The Payne-Aldrich law puts upon the free list—

All binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, manilla, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 600 feet to the pound.

Then paragraph 359 of the Payne-Aldrich bill reads:

Istle or Tampico, when dressed, dyed, or combed, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Now, notwithstanding the fact that this seeming incongruity to which the Senator calls attention existed in that bill, it never interfered in the slightest degree with the free admission of binding twine, and therefore it will not interfere in the future.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, as follows:

Schedule K. Wool and manufactures of—

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask that Schedule K be passed over this afternoon and that we take up Schedule L.

There are Senators who desire to be here when Schedule K is taken up and who are temporarily absent from the Chamber at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Schedule L will be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 91, line 24.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in Schedule L, silks and silk goods, paragraph 319, page 92, line 2, after the word "length," to strike out "15 per cent ad valorem" and insert "30 cents per pound," so as to make the paragraph read:

319. Silk partially manufactured from cocoons or from waste silk and not further advanced or manufactured than carded or combed silk, and silk noils exceeding 2 inches in length, 30 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, to strike out paragraph 320, as follows:

320. Spun silk or schappe silk yarn, 35 per cent ad valorem.

And to insert the following:

320. Spun silk or schappe silk yarn valued at not exceeding \$1 per pound, whether single, two, or more ply, 30 cents per pound; if valued at exceeding \$1 per pound, in the gray, if in singles, on all numbers up to and including No. 215, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 215, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; in the gray, if two or more ply, on all numbers up to and including No. 215, 50 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 215, 50 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound. The rates of duty on the foregoing yarns when colored, bleached, or dyed, shall be 10 cents per pound in addition to the rates herein provided for the respective yarns in their gray, or undyed state. When the foregoing gray, colored, bleached, or dyed yarns are on bobbins, cones, spools, or beams the rates of duty shall be 10 cents per pound in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon. In assessing duty on all spun silk or schappe silk yarn, the number indicating the size of the yarn shall be taken according to the metric or French system, and shall in all cases refer to the size of the singles: *Provided*, That in no case shall the duty be assessed on a less number of yards than is marked on the skeins, bobbins, cones, cops, spools, or beams. But in no case shall any of the goods enumerated in this paragraph pay a less rate of duty than 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, to strike out paragraph 321, as follows:

321. Thrown silk not more advanced than singles, tram, or organzine, sewing silk, twist, floss, and silk threads or yarns of every description made from raw silk, 15 per cent ad valorem.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

321. Thrown silk in the gum, in skeins, on bobbins, spools, cops, or otherwise, if singles, 35 cents per pound; if tram, 55 cents per pound; if organzine, 75 cents per pound; and if ungunned, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture, in addition to the rates herein provided, 35 cents per pound. Sewing silk, twist, floss, and silk threads or yarns of any description made from raw silk, not specially provided for in this section, if in the gum, 75 cents per pound; if ungunned, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture, \$1.05 per pound: *Provided*, That in no case shall a duty be assessed on a less number of yards than is marked on the skeins, bobbins, cops, spools, or beams.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee is, on page 94, to strike out paragraph 322, in the following words:

322. Velvets, plushes, chenilles, velvet or plush ribbons, or other pile fabrics, composed of silk or of which silk is the component material of chief value, 50 per cent ad valorem.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

322. Velvets, chenilles, or other pile fabrics, not specially provided for in this section, cut or uncut, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, weighing not less than 5½ ounces per square yard, \$1.25 per pound; weighing less than 5½ ounces per square yard, but not less than 4 ounces, or if all the filling is not cotton, \$2.50 per pound; if all the filling is of cotton, \$1.75 per pound; all the foregoing weighing less than 4 ounces per square yard, \$3.25 per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question in relation to this paragraph. Why was it that the rate was reduced from \$1.50 a yard to \$1.25, and from \$2.75 to \$2.50 on items just read?

Mr. HUGHES. We tried to change the specific rate as nearly as possible to the ad valorem rate.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the present law provides specific rates on velvet chenilles and other items mentioned.

Mr. HUGHES. The House suggestion was an ad valorem rate, and we were trying to avoid the suggestion that there was an attempt to raise the rate by means of a specific duty. We brought it down to the House suggested rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I am a little wrong, because the way I figured it the House ad valorem rates were about the same as the present specific rates. In some cases they were just a little under and in some cases just a little over. Seeing that the balance of the items carry about the same rates as the present law, I wondered why the change should be made in those mentioned.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not make the mathematical calculation myself, but turned it over to a gentleman who has more skill than I have in that direction and I asked him to change the House ad valorems into specific rates. After he was through I went over it and satisfied myself that it was done correctly so far as my ability could check it up was concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not objecting to the rate. That was not the question. What I wanted to know was why those items were treated somewhat different from the others. Of course the Senator's explanation is satisfactory to me. I merely wanted to know why it was done.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the committee amendment, in paragraph 322, beginning in line 11, page 94, and read as follows:

Plushes, cut or uncut, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, weighing not less than 9½ ounces per square yard, \$1 per pound; weighing less than 9½ ounces, \$2 per pound. Measurements to ascertain the widths of goods for determining weight per square yard of the foregoing articles shall not include the selvages, but the duty shall be levied upon the total weight of goods including the selvages. The distinction between plushes and velvets shall be determined by the length of the pile; those having pile exceeding one-seventh of 1 inch in length to be taken as plushes; those having pile one-seventh of 1 inch or less in length shall be taken as velvets. The distance from the end of the pile to the bottom of the first binding pick shall be considered as the length of the pile. But in no case shall any goods enumerated in this paragraph, including such as have india rubber as a component material, pay a less rate than 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is a new provision in the law. Does the Senator from New Jersey think that that would conflict with the cotton schedule and the hemp schedule, wherein provision is made for cotton and hemp goods which may contain silk or india rubber? I will not ask the Senator to answer that offhand now; he can do so subsequently.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that it would be better to read the amendment through, and then any questions may be raised as to the amendment.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment, as follows:

Velvet or plush ribbons, or other pile fabrics, not over 12 inches, and not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in width, cut or uncut, of which silk is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, containing no silk except that in the pile and selvages, if black \$1.50 per pound, if other than black \$1.65 per pound; if containing silk other than that in the pile and selvages, if black \$1.75 per pound, if other than black \$2.25 per pound; for each one-fourth of 1 inch or fraction thereof, less than three-fourths of 1 inch in width, there shall be paid in addition to the above rates 35 cents per pound. But in no case shall any of the foregoing pay a less rate of duty than 50 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 323, page 95, line 18, before the word "silk," to insert "woven"; and in line 19, after the word "only," to strike out "40" and insert "45," so as to make the paragraph read:

323. Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed wholly or in chief value of woven silk, finished or unfinished; if cut, not hemmed or hemmed only, 45 per cent ad valorem; if hemstitched or imitation hemstitched, or

reversed, or having drawn threads, but not embroidered in any manner with an initial letter, monogram, or otherwise, 50 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 324, page 96, line 3, after the word "manner," to strike out "40" and insert "45," so as to make the paragraph read:

324. Ribbons, bandings, including hatbands, beltings, bindings, all of the foregoing not exceeding 12 inches in width and if with fast edges, bone casings, braces, cords, cords and tassels, garters, suspenders, tubings, and webs and webbings; all the foregoing made of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, if not embroidered in any manner, 45 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraph 325, as follows:

325. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including knit goods, made up or manufactured in whole or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer; all the foregoing composed of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if paragraph 325, referring to "clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description," covers exclusively goods made of silk?

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator will notice that the paragraph provides in line 8:

All the foregoing composed of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value.

That, of course, confines it to silk goods or to goods of which silk or silk and india rubber are the materials of chief value.

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator please state just what articles of wearing apparel would be covered by the paragraph?

Mr. HUGHES. It refers to high priced and expensive silk dresses and silk garments of all kinds, which are imported in great quantities into this country. It would also cover silk underwear; but I think it will be found—I have often thought I would like to investigate as to that—that the imports under this bill will be largely Worth dresses and articles of that kind.

Mr. BRISTOW. The language is:

All the foregoing composed of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, not specially provided for in this section.

Mr. HUGHES. That, of course, applies to fancy silk rain-coats and articles of that kind.

Mr. BRISTOW. If it only refers to expensive and luxurious garments, I have no objection to it.

Mr. HUGHES. That, of course, is what it does refer to, and that is the object in leaving the rate of duty as high as it is, so that we can obtain revenue. We can obtain more revenue, I think, by raising the duty on these articles than by lowering it.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and paragraph 326 was read, as follows:

326. Woven fabrics, in the piece or otherwise, of which silk is the component material of chief value, and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Jersey to allow that paragraph to go over. I will state to the Senator that my intention is to offer an amendment to the paragraph providing specific rates of duty, instead of ad valorem rates on the broad silks.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say that I stated to the Senator before we took up the schedule that that paragraph might go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 326 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 327, page 96, line 19, after the word "made," to strike out "35" and insert "25," so as to make the paragraph read:

327. Yarns, threads, filaments of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, 25 per cent ad valorem; beltings, cords, tassels, ribbons, or other articles or fabrics composed wholly or in chief value of yarns, threads, filaments, or fibers of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair, or of yarns, threads, filaments, or fibers of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair and india rubber, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, 60 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 2, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

327½. In ascertaining the weight or the number indicating the size of silk under the provisions of this section, either in the threads, yarns, or fabrics, the weight or the number shall be taken in the condition in which found in the goods, without deductions therefrom for any dye, coloring matter, moisture, or other foreign substance or material.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, that completes the silk schedule, and we may now go on with Schedule M.

The reading of the bill was resumed at Schedule M—Papers and books.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 328, page 97, after the word "paper," to insert "pulpboard in rolls, not laminated," so as to make the paragraph read:

328. Sheathing paper, pulpboard in rolls, not laminated, and roofing felt, 5 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 330, page 98, line 6, before the word "export," to strike out "such" and insert "the highest"; and in line 8, after the word "upon," to insert "either," so as to make the paragraph read:

330. Printing paper (other than paper commercially known as hand-made or machine handmade paper, japan paper, and imitation japan paper by whatever name known), unsized, sized, or glued, suitable for the printing of books and newspapers, but not for covers or bindings, not specially provided for in this section, valued above 2½ cents per pound, 12 per cent ad valorem: *Provided, however,* That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose any export duty, export license fee, or other charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise) upon printing paper, wood pulp, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp, there shall be imposed upon printing paper, valued above 2½ cents per pound, when imported either directly or indirectly from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, an additional duty equal to the amount of the highest export duty or other export charge imposed by such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, upon either printing paper, or upon an amount of wood pulp, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp necessary to manufacture such printing paper.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this paragraph is connected with the provisions in the free list and with the retaliatory or countervailing duties concerning which I desire to say something to the Senate.

I do not desire to delay the progress of the bill, but I want to feel that the paragraph is open to further discussion, for I did not expect that the paper schedule would be taken up to-night. I ask that the paragraph go over for the present.

Mr. HUGHES. I am perfectly willing to have it go over. I myself did not expect the paper schedule to come up. We only desire to get through with as much of the bill as we can.

Mr. LODGE. I did not expect the paper schedule to come up to-day, or I should have brought my papers with me and been prepared to go on.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought we might as well use the half hour remaining by going ahead with such items as we may.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we have made unusual progress to-day, and no one anticipated that the paper schedule would come up. I think the schedule ought to go over.

Mr. HUGHES. I am perfectly satisfied to have any paragraph go over, but I thought we might as well use the remaining half hour.

Mr. LODGE. There are a number of paragraphs in the paper schedule which will require more or less debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think we can agree, if any Senator desires a paragraph to go over until to-morrow, that it may go over. Of course we have taken up this schedule unexpectedly.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have sent word to one or two Senators who are deeply interested in this schedule, but who are absent from the Chamber. I do not know exactly which paragraphs they wish to debate; but I do know that they want to be here at the time the schedule is being considered.

Mr. SIMMONS. We may return to any paragraph that Senators desire to return to in order that they may have an opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina knows that some of us on this side have been expediting the consideration of the bill as much as possible to-day, and would not the Senator agree to an adjournment at this hour? There are quite a number of Senators absent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; if the Senator asks it, under the circumstances I can not resist him.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will make that request.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have done very well to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will make that request, Mr. President, and am glad that the Senator will agree to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. As I have said, we have done very well to-day, in view of the fact that we devoted about three hours to general discussion. I understand there is a desire to have a short executive session, I will say to the Senator.

In view of the importance of Senators knowing exactly what schedules we are going to take up, and to avoid any misunder-

standing as to what schedule we will go on with to-morrow, in view of the fact that we started on the paper schedule this afternoon, I desire to announce that I shall ask the Senate in the morning to take up the wool schedule.

DESERT-LAND ENTRIES, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business I should like to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill on the calendar, which will take, I think, but two or three minutes and will involve no debate. It is purely of local application, and has been reported by the Committee on Public Lands. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1673.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1673) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the county of Grant, State of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JONES. There was one amendment which was adopted in the committee, but apparently was left out by mistake in making the report. After the words "required to," in line 6, I move to insert the words "comply with the law and."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. By what committee was the bill considered?

Mr. JONES. By the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Was there a unanimous report in favor of the measure?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. There was a unanimous report, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator from Washington make a brief statement as to why this bill should be passed, applying, as it does, to a single county?

Mr. JONES. The matter was brought to my attention by some of the people who would be affected by the measure, who had made entries under an irrigation project which had failed, and by reason of the failure they were unable to make their proofs. Personally I am in favor of general legislation, and in the last Congress a general bill was introduced covering situations of that kind; but in another body it was insisted that such legislation should be made to apply to a particular locality. Apparently they did not desire to pass general legislation. So the bill has been put in this shape. While it was suggested by the Secretary of the Interior that general legislation should be passed, the committee thought it best to report the bill for this particular locality. Personally, as I have said, I should like to see the enactment of general legislation on the subject.

Mr. SHAFROTH. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. JONES. It grants an extension of time for making desert-land proof in Grant County, Wash.

Mr. SMOOT. If I am not mistaken, the department suggested general legislation.

Mr. JONES. The department did suggest general legislation. After the words "required to," in line 6, I move to insert the words "comply with the law and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, after the words "required to," it is proposed to insert the words "comply with the law and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. In line 5 I move to strike out the word "county" and to insert "counties," and after the word "Grant" to insert the words "and Franklin," which will make it apply to an adjoining county where similar conditions exist. I submitted that amendment to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and he said that would be satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 5, before the words "of Grant," it is proposed to strike out "county" and insert "counties," and in the same line, after the name "Grant," to insert "and Franklin," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, grant to any entryman under the desert-land laws in the counties of Grant and Franklin, in the State of Washington, a further extension of time within which he is required to comply with the law and make final proof: *Provided,* That such entryman shall, by his corroborated affidavit, filed in the land office of the district where such land is located, show to the satisfaction of the Secretary that because of unavoidable delay in the construction and operation of irrigation

works intended to convey water to the land embraced in his entry he is, without fault on his part, unable to make proof of the reclamation and cultivation of said lands, as required by law, within the time limited therefor but such extension shall not be granted for a period of more than three years, and this act shall not affect contests initiated for a valid existing reason.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the only effect of this bill will be to give certain claimants a longer time in which to perfect their claims and get their patents.

Mr. JONES. If they make a satisfactory showing to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If they make a satisfactory showing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How much longer does it grant them?

Mr. JONES. Three years.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JONES, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries in the counties of Grant and Franklin, State of Washington."

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MINORS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, since it is yet some minutes of 6 o'clock, I wonder if I may not call the attention of Senators to Senate bill No. 2419? I do so, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2419) permitting male minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, in section 1, page 1, line 6, before the word "minor," to strike out "male," and on page 2, line 4, after the word "he," to insert "or she," so as to make the section read:

That in all cases wherein persons of the age of 21 years or over are now permitted to make homestead entry or other entry of lands under the public-land laws of the United States any minor of the age of 18 years or over and otherwise qualified under such laws shall be permitted to make such entry, subject to all the provisions of such laws in regard to residence upon and improvement and cultivation of such lands: *Provided, however,* That no minor shall be eligible to make final homestead proof and receive a homestead patent for any such lands until at least 14 months after having attained the age of 21 years, nor eligible to make final proof or receive patent on other than a homestead entry until he or she has attained the age of 21 years.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 22, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 21, 1913.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin Lowry Humes, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice John H. Jordan, whose term has expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

A. F. Browns, of Sterling, Colo., to be register of the land office at Sterling, vice William H. Pound, term expired.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Maj. Herbert M. Lord, Quartermaster Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 4, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Beecher B. Ray, whose recess appointment expired by constitutional limitation March 3, 1913.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Passed Asst. Surg. Charles C. Grieve to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 22d day of January, 1913.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 13th day of August, 1913:

Guthrie McConnell, a citizen of Pennsylvania, and

Howard A. Tribou, a citizen of Maine.

Carpenter Joel A. Davis to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 21, 1913.

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Francis Burton Harrison to be Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

POSTMASTERS.

NEBRASKA.

Andrew B. Anderson, Florence.

J. E. Scott, Osmond.

Orren Slote, Litchfield.

Rainard B. Wahlquist, Hastings.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank J. Callahan, McClusky.

Andrew D. Cochrane, York.

James J. Dougherty, Park River.

P. J. Filbin, Steele.

Charles E. Harding, Churchs Ferry.

Carl Jahnke, New Salem.

Robert A. Long, Drayton.

J. H. McLean, Hannah.

W. T. Reilly, Milton.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas H. Galvin, East Greenwich.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 22, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GOODS IN BOND (S. DOC. NO. 166).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 21, 1913.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 1st instant, requesting for the use of the Senate certain information relative to goods remaining in warehouse without the payment of duty August 1, 1912, and August 1, 1913, I have the honor to advise you that the values and duties requested are as follows:

Value of merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1912.....	\$71,561,698
Duty on same under present tariff.....	40,767,828
Value of merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1913.....	104,576,937
Duty on same under present tariff.....	58,256,272
Estimated duty under H. R. 3321 on merchandise in warehouse Aug. 1, 1913.....	48,499,214

Respectfully,

JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS,
Acting Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication is in response to a resolution introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. What does the Senator desire to have done with the communication?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will be printed and lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3021) granting an increase of pension to Christina Nicholes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3022) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.